

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1466
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	7	5	1	3.06	1598/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	10	4	0	2.89	1607/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	7	4	3	3.17	1305/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	3	6	4	2	3.06	1532/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	5	1	0	2.50	1511/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	4	5	1	2.72	1483/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	10	2	2	3.12	1520/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	697/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	2	6	4	1	2.88	1541/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1257/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1133/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	1073/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	3	6	3.56	1357/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1064/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1205/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	5	1	4	3	3.21	1287/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	3.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	5	1	4	3	3.21	1263/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	800/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	164/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	7	4	2	3.62	198/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	3.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	156/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	151/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	473/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	3.46	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1466
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1467
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	6	3	3.30	1548/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1094/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	992/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	943/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1415/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	6	4	6	3.40	1320/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	883/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	398/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1184/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	852/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	715/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	651/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	0	8	8	3.85	1221/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	508/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	737/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	827/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	281/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	79/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	61/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	99/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	33/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	311/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.44	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

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	3	3	7	3	3.33	1540/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1245/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	5	3	3.28	1275/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1377/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	7	3	1	2.67	1487/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	2	4	6	3.50	1387/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	782/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	4	6	7	0	3.18	1470/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1176/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	1241/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	1191/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	0	7	4	3.50	1370/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	981/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1244/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1146/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1085/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	885/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	181/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	201/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	3.58	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	126/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	109/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	2	0	4	5	3.83	442/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3			
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

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

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1469
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1540/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1471/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1008/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1416/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	6	4	0	3.00	1441/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1089/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1241/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	8	0	3.46	1369/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	767/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1174/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	908/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1258/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	848/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1029/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1165/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1043/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	77/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	103/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	74/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	90/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	308/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.45	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1469
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1470
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	1037/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	825/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	694/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	497/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1084/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	849/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	2	7	3.81	1234/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1167/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	480/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	665/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	447/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	390/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	221/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	394/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	601/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	330/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	50/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	47/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	43/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	368/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.19	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1470
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1471
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	1	6	3.35	1536/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	977/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1032/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	2	5	3.56	1207/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1191/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	635/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	714/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1096/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	461/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	790/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	570/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	1023/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	473/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1047/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	927/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1059/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	614/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	110/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	91/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	65/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	72/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	293/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	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	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

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	6	2	1	9	3.58	1479/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	1428/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	915/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	5	3	7	3.67	1335/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	1214/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	9	3	3.44	1298/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	683/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	7	6	1	3.25	1451/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	827/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	1108/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	1	5	11	4.21	981/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	6	9	4.00	1121/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	624/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	901/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1165/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1215/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	758/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	178/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	0	10	4.36	105/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	105/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	146/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	363/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.21	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	40/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	3.60	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	40/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	3.40	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	25/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	4.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	Under-grad 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0

- Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1473
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1479/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1208/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	3	5	3.77	1107/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	0	5	4	3.69	1317/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	1	6	3.62	1173/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1314/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	1	6	3.77	1264/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	914/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1243/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1071/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	966/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	0	9	4.31	482/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	901/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	426/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	431/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	172/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	3.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	150/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	34/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	129/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	311/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.44	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1474
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5	1	4	3.29	1552/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1271/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	7	4	3.79	1097/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1270/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	2	5	0	3.00	1441/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1101/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1293/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1151/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	715/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1127/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	1226/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	457/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	795/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	578/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	860/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	431/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	129/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	62/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	74/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	112/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	380/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.09
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1474
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1475
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	7	1	3.24	1564/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1474/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1076/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1347/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	1	0	4	3.10	1423/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	5	6	3.53	1253/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	838/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	897/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	3	0	4	7	0	3.07	1492/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	1031/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	14	4.59	1165/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	897/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1270/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	779/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	2	3	3.38	1132/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	1	0	8	4.09	925/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1032/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	431/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	115/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	65/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	77/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	95/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	263/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1475
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	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	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1476
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	2	6	4	1	2.67	1636/1649	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.11	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	1532/1648	3.75	3.87	4.23	4.16	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	8	3	3.50	1208/1375	3.79	3.94	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	10	0	3.39	1452/1595	3.73	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	4	4	3	1	0	2.08	1525/1533	3.12	3.20	4.04	3.87	2.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	6	5	1	2.89	1462/1512	3.40	3.54	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1258/1623	3.88	4.03	4.16	4.08	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.92	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	7	2	2	3.33	1429/1621	3.49	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	1112/1568	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	1222/1572	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1073/1564	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1349/1559	3.92	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	4	6	6	3.68	960/1352	4.05	4.13	3.98	3.86	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	953/1384	3.74	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1195/1382	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.03	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1039/1368	3.97	4.04	4.30	4.01	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.73	3.80	3.95	3.75	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	185/ 221	4.06	4.11	4.16	4.05	3.62	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	152/ 243	4.24	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	101/ 212	4.59	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.54	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	178/ 209	4.42	4.48	4.35	4.38	3.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	373/ 555	4.23	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.15	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.60	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	3.40	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 0
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1477
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	5	1	3.25	1560/1649	3.25	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	999/1648	4.17	3.87	4.23	4.16	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	653/1375	4.42	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1188/1595	3.92	3.86	4.20	4.03	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1392/1533	3.18	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1137/1512	3.73	3.54	4.10	3.86	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.93	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	3.60	4.06	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1393/1572	4.27	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1564	4.64	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1016/1559	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	638/1352	4.09	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1039/1384	3.60	3.81	4.08	3.86	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1128/1382	3.70	4.10	4.29	4.03	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	920/1368	4.10	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	353/ 948	4.22	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	174/ 221	3.75	4.11	4.16	4.05	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	55/ 243	4.63	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	65/ 212	4.75	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	84/ 209	4.63	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.71	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.57	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.17	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.43	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1477
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1478
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1279/1649	4.07	3.45	4.28	4.11	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	756/1648	4.39	3.87	4.23	4.16	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	0	14	4.47	581/1375	4.53	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	417/1595	4.57	3.86	4.20	4.03	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1065/1533	3.70	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	493/1512	4.24	3.54	4.10	3.86	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	296/1623	4.64	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	680/1646	4.95	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	824/1621	4.14	3.60	4.06	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	517/1568	4.77	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1046/1572	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	580/1564	4.56	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	487/1559	4.78	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	331/1352	4.56	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	755/1384	4.28	3.81	4.08	3.86	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	917/1382	4.41	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	915/1368	4.41	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	431/ 948	3.93	3.80	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	42/ 221	4.62	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.68	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	30/ 243	4.69	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.79	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	17/ 212	4.85	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.95	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	81/ 209	4.73	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	229/ 555	4.83	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	4.71	4.71	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	4.57	4.57	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	4.17	4.17	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	4.43	4.43	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	4.50	4.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	4.17	3.88	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 48	4.00	3.70	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	4.80	4.80	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	3.40	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1478
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors 16	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 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1479
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	986/1649	4.07	3.45	4.28	4.11	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	687/1648	4.39	3.87	4.23	4.16	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	480/1375	4.53	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	428/1595	4.57	3.86	4.20	4.03	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1153/1533	3.70	3.20	4.04	3.87	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	854/1512	4.24	3.54	4.10	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	416/1623	4.64	4.03	4.16	4.08	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.93	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	4.14	3.60	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	387/1568	4.77	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	690/1572	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	620/1564	4.56	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	250/1559	4.78	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	221/1352	4.56	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	499/1384	4.28	3.81	4.08	3.86	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	455/1382	4.41	4.10	4.29	4.03	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.41	4.04	4.30	4.01	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	555/ 948	3.93	3.80	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	57/ 221	4.62	4.11	4.16	4.05	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	59/ 243	4.69	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.59	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	65/ 212	4.85	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	42/ 209	4.73	4.48	4.35	4.38	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	249/ 555	4.83	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.76	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	41/ 88	4.71	4.71	4.54	4.31	4.71	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	44/ 85	4.57	4.57	4.47	4.30	4.57	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	57/ 81	4.17	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.17	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	51/ 92	4.43	4.43	4.35	4.01	4.43	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.50	3.68	3.54	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	31/ 52	4.17	3.88	4.06	3.72	4.17	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	3.70	4.09	3.65	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	15/ 39	4.80	4.80	4.47	4.36	4.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	37/ 39	3.40	3.80	4.38	4.37	3.40	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1479
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						