

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	2	13	9	13	3.74	1267/1449	3.70	3.70	4.33	4.14	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	10	26	4.56	492/1446	4.36	4.36	4.29	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	13	23	4.49	544/1256	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.21	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	22	4.38	688/1402	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	2	1	7	12	7	3.72	1060/1358	3.61	3.61	4.13	4.04	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	9	8	18	4.19	712/1327	3.93	3.93	4.16	3.92	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	268/1435	4.48	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1446	4.91	4.91	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	8	12	4	3.76	1110/1437	3.81	3.81	4.12	4.04	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	553/1386	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	872/1390	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	0	10	18	4.55	576/1379	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	5	6	16	4.29	875/1379	4.43	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	352/1236	4.42	4.42	4.08	3.93	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	772/1121	3.86	3.86	4.18	3.89	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	691/1122	4.24	4.24	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	591/1121	4.56	4.56	4.40	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	287/790	4.33	4.33	4.06	3.89	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	2	8	12	4.21	120/200	4.24	4.24	4.28	4.19	4.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	125/205	4.46	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.35
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	119/201	4.57	4.57	4.51	4.57	4.52
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	114/202	4.49	4.49	4.42	4.55	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	10/196	4.62	4.62	4.25	4.42	4.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	27	Under-grad	40	Non-major	21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	2	13	9	13	3.74	1267/1449	3.70	3.70	4.33	4.14	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	10	26	4.56	492/1446	4.36	4.36	4.29	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	13	23	4.49	544/1256	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.21	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	22	4.38	688/1402	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	2	1	7	12	7	3.72	1060/1358	3.61	3.61	4.13	4.04	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	9	8	18	4.19	712/1327	3.93	3.93	4.16	3.92	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	268/1435	4.48	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1446	4.91	4.91	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	809/1437	3.81	3.81	4.12	4.04	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1386	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	478/1390	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	114/1379	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	385/1379	4.43	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	107/1236	4.42	4.42	4.08	3.93	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	772/1121	3.86	3.86	4.18	3.89	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	691/1122	4.24	4.24	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	591/1121	4.56	4.56	4.40	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	287/790	4.33	4.33	4.06	3.89	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	2	8	12	4.21	120/200	4.24	4.24	4.28	4.19	4.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	125/205	4.46	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.35
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	119/201	4.57	4.57	4.51	4.57	4.52
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	114/202	4.49	4.49	4.42	4.55	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	10/196	4.62	4.62	4.25	4.42	4.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	27	Under-grad	40	Non-major	21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	97
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	3	6	17	13	14	3.55	1345/1449	3.70	3.70	4.33	4.14	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	4	10	10	27	4.12	997/1446	4.36	4.36	4.29	4.20	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	10	10	26	4.06	915/1256	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.21	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	3	13	10	24	4.10	957/1402	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	20	3	3	11	3	12	3.56	1144/1358	3.61	3.61	4.13	4.04	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	15	12	16	3.71	1037/1327	3.93	3.93	4.16	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	8	9	30	4.21	808/1435	4.48	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	16	35	4.69	868/1446	4.91	4.91	4.67	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	15	18	13	3.75	1124/1437	3.81	3.81	4.12	4.04	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	5	8	37	4.50	803/1386	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	5	41	4.72	923/1390	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	7	17	26	4.33	832/1379	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	3	6	11	28	4.27	892/1379	4.43	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	4	8	17	18	3.98	743/1236	4.42	4.42	4.08	3.93	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	****/1121	3.86	3.86	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	****/1122	4.24	4.24	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/1121	4.56	4.56	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	46	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	****/790	4.33	4.33	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	97
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	2	5	10	24	4.29	106/200	4.24	4.24	4.28	4.19	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	3	9	29	4.57	69/205	4.46	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	1	1	7	32	4.71	76/201	4.57	4.57	4.51	4.57	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	2	2	1	3	4	30	4.48	114/202	4.49	4.49	4.42	4.55	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	3	5	4	30	4.45	85/196	4.62	4.62	4.25	4.42	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/75	****	****	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	97
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	29	Under-grad	55	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	4	9	10	14	3.77	1257/1449	3.70	3.70	4.33	4.14	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	11	19	4.18	944/1446	4.36	4.36	4.29	4.20	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	6	20	3.92	1000/1256	4.24	4.24	4.34	4.21	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	3	14	15	4.11	947/1402	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	3	10	5	11	3.41	1201/1358	3.61	3.61	4.13	4.04	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	5	9	8	11	3.60	1089/1327	3.93	3.93	4.16	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	1	8	24	4.32	709/1435	4.48	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	158/1446	4.91	4.91	4.67	4.57	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	0	7	15	3	3.63	1191/1437	3.81	3.81	4.12	4.04	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	691/1386	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	30	4.69	969/1390	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	8	26	4.58	553/1379	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	7	24	4.42	766/1379	4.43	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	5	6	23	4.39	452/1236	4.42	4.42	4.08	3.93	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	877/1121	3.86	3.86	4.18	3.89	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	5	1	8	4.07	842/1122	4.24	4.24	4.36	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	473/1121	4.56	4.56	4.40	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	25	8	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/790	4.33	4.33	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	2	0	2	4	14	4.27	108/200	4.24	4.24	4.28	4.19	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	2	2	17	4.59	65/205	4.46	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	116/201	4.57	4.57	4.51	4.57	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	96/202	4.49	4.49	4.42	4.55	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	2	0	1	3	16	4.41	102/196	4.62	4.62	4.25	4.42	4.41
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	31	Under-grad	40	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						