

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	2	9	17	4.19	991/1520	3.73	3.73	4.31	4.14	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	7	22	4.50	584/1520	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	6	23	4.53	514/1291	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.24	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	2	5	21	4.32	724/1483	4.04	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	7	5	12	4.00	803/1417	3.70	3.70	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	4	8	16	4.10	798/1405	3.75	3.75	4.12	3.96	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	0	4	26	4.63	311/1504	4.28	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	864/1519	4.72	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	15	4	3.88	1037/1495	3.88	3.88	4.11	4.01	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	27	4.81	374/1459	4.68	4.68	4.47	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	381/1460	4.88	4.88	4.74	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	27	4.77	307/1455	4.60	4.60	4.32	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	23	4.63	541/1456	4.43	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	4	4	20	4.57	256/1316	4.26	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	405/1243	4.03	4.03	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	395/1241	4.32	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	328/1236	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.19	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	186/889	4.19	4.19	4.02	3.89	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	2	0	2	5	9	4.06	110/164	4.17	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	2	0	4	11	4.22	91/165	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.31	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	2	0	0	3	13	4.39	104/160	4.55	4.55	4.45	4.49	4.39
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	2	0	1	3	11	4.24	103/158	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.43	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	39/150	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.26	4.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	22	Under-grad	33	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	2	9	17	4.19	991/1520	3.73	3.73	4.31	4.14	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	7	22	4.50	584/1520	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	6	23	4.53	514/1291	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.24	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	2	5	21	4.32	724/1483	4.04	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	7	5	12	4.00	803/1417	3.70	3.70	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	4	8	16	4.10	798/1405	3.75	3.75	4.12	3.96	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	0	4	26	4.63	311/1504	4.28	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	864/1519	4.72	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.74
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	405/1243	4.03	4.03	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	395/1241	4.32	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	328/1236	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.19	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	186/889	4.19	4.19	4.02	3.89	4.50
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	2	0	2	5	9	4.06	110/164	4.17	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	2	0	4	11	4.22	91/165	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.31	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	2	0	0	3	13	4.39	104/160	4.55	4.55	4.45	4.49	4.39
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	2	0	1	3	11	4.24	103/158	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.43	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	39/150	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.26	4.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> SCI 100 100	<b>Term - Fall 2011</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 100
<b>Title:</b> Water; Interdis Study		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 33
<b>Instructor:</b> Braunschweig,Su		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	22	Under-grad	33	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	4	12	22	16	3.82	1265/1520	3.73	3.73	4.31	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	10	16	28	4.23	912/1520	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	18	24	4.11	924/1291	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.24	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	2	12	18	18	4.04	990/1483	4.04	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	3	6	13	14	11	3.51	1182/1417	3.70	3.70	4.08	4.02	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	4	18	18	14	3.73	1087/1405	3.75	3.75	4.12	3.96	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	12	12	28	4.13	893/1504	4.28	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	42	4.76	840/1519	4.72	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	10	18	19	4.10	822/1495	3.88	3.88	4.11	4.01	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	0	8	43	4.74	498/1459	4.68	4.68	4.47	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	5	47	4.85	701/1460	4.88	4.88	4.74	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	2	13	36	4.55	592/1455	4.60	4.60	4.32	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	1	2	12	35	4.48	704/1456	4.43	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	3	2	10	12	23	4.00	729/1316	4.26	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	903/1243	4.03	4.03	4.17	3.98	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	968/1241	4.32	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	725/1236	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.19	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	43	1	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	****/889	4.19	4.19	4.02	3.89	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	1	5	24	19	4.12	104/164	4.17	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.12
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	2	4	13	31	4.39	66/165	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.31	4.39
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	4	10	36	4.57	75/160	4.55	4.55	4.45	4.49	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	6	14	30	4.41	89/158	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.43	4.41
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	5	4	11	29	4.18	74/150	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.26	4.18
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 24		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 6	General 33	Under-grad 58 Non-major 34
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 13	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 1	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 11		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	10	12	8	10	3.23	1480/1520	3.73	3.73	4.31	4.14	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	19	18	4.21	940/1520	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	14	22	4.27	802/1291	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.24	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	11	15	12	3.75	1209/1483	4.04	4.04	4.23	4.09	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	7	6	11	7	3.50	1187/1417	3.70	3.70	4.08	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	5	16	12	7	3.40	1241/1405	3.75	3.75	4.12	3.96	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	8	17	15	4.00	999/1504	4.28	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	32	4.68	933/1519	4.72	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	15	13	7	3.65	1217/1495	3.88	3.88	4.11	4.01	3.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	16	24	4.49	859/1459	4.68	4.68	4.47	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	38	4.86	648/1460	4.88	4.88	4.74	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	14	26	4.47	686/1455	4.60	4.60	4.32	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	12	22	4.19	1003/1456	4.43	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	5	13	21	4.21	577/1316	4.26	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	1	4	10	5	3.68	976/1243	4.03	4.03	4.17	3.98	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	859/1241	4.32	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	838/1236	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.19	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	559/889	4.19	4.19	4.02	3.89	3.88

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	69/164	4.17	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	76/165	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.31	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	53/160	4.55	4.55	4.45	4.49	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	122/158	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.43	4.05
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	80/150	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.26	4.13
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 28	Under-grad 45 Non-major 17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	10	12	8	10	3.23	1480/1520	3.73	3.73	4.31	4.14	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	19	18	4.21	940/1520	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	14	22	4.27	802/1291	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.24	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	11	15	12	3.75	1209/1483	4.04	4.04	4.23	4.09	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	7	6	11	7	3.50	1187/1417	3.70	3.70	4.08	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	5	16	12	7	3.40	1241/1405	3.75	3.75	4.12	3.96	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	8	17	15	4.00	999/1504	4.28	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	32	4.68	933/1519	4.72	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	42	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1495	3.88	3.88	4.11	4.01	3.65
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	1	4	10	5	3.68	976/1243	4.03	4.03	4.17	3.98	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	859/1241	4.32	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	838/1236	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.19	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	559/889	4.19	4.19	4.02	3.89	3.88
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	69/164	4.17	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	76/165	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.31	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	53/160	4.55	4.55	4.45	4.49	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	122/158	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.43	4.05
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	80/150	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.26	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> SCI 100 300	<b>Term - Fall 2011</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 98
<b>Title:</b> Water; Interdis Study		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 45
<b>Instructor:</b> Braunschweig,Su		

  

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 28	Under-grad 45
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 6		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant