

Course Section: SCI 100 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1487
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	9	5	4.06	1131/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	827/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	764/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	934/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	773/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	819/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1178/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	965/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	918/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	132/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	500/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	496/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	1	10	4.31	405/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	812/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	326/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	280/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	135/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	110/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	81/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	54/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	91/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	70/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SCI 100 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1487
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0102
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1488
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	1	6	7	4.00	1173/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	461/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	417/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	475/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	1	3	3	4	3.29	1345/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	6	3.53	1253/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	161/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	851/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	223/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	307/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	335/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	585/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	1	12	4.24	458/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	790/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	564/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	344/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	77/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	62/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	86/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	47/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.81	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SCI 100 0102
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1488
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0103
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1489
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	769/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	243/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	210/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	156/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	734/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	334/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	213/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	565/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	132/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	277/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	112/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	718/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	41/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.81	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	36/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	60/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	47/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	39/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1490
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	0	5	9	4.00	1173/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	3	11	4.24	908/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	417/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	821/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	996/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	969/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	0	6	9	4.18	940/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	918/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	308/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	705/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	510/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	496/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	137/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	680/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	500/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	424/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	92/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	48/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	88/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.72	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	45/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	23/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9	Required for Majors 14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 18
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: SCI 100 0105
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1491
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	769/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	727/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	710/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	801/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	980/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	723/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	759/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	666/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	441/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	438/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	585/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	264/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1142/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1154/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	5	1	7	4.15	980/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	381/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	66/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	51/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	68/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	55/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0201
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1492
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1173/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	549/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	441/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1170/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	895/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	697/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	12	2	4.07	877/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	553/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	438/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	585/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	312/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	836/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	920/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	209/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	94/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	51/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	83/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	93/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: SCI 100 0202
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1493
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	5	3	8	4.19	1001/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	483/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	502/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	773/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	543/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	281/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	789/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	132/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	163/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	219/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	778/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	754/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	553/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	376/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	67/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	80/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	66/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	64/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	40/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course Section: SCI 100 0204
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1494
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1253/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	412/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	557/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	946/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	734/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	981/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	78/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	499/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	240/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	210/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	613/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	153/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	675/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	648/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	360/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	47/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	51/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	75/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	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	2	
?	0			

Course Section: SCI 100 0301
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1495
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	6	3	4	3.28	1557/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	984/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1100/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1212/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	4	4	5	2	3.19	1389/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	8	2	5	3.59	1232/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	583/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	918/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	616/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	438/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1069/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	654/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1022/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1129/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	753/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	789/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	92/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	81/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	122/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	103/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	56/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SCI 100 0301
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1495
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1496
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	2	4	3.64	1423/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	620/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	871/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1268/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1155/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1246/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	997/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	1125/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1210/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	537/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	936/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	958/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	333/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	632/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	235/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	129/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	93/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	122/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	65/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	69/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1496
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	1						

Course Section: SCI 100 0303
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1497
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	10	4	4.06	1131/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	549/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	871/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	739/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1383/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1043/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	600/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	690/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	132/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	438/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	286/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	445/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	837/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	413/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	97/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	71/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	78/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	64/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	44/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.79	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	1				
				?	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0304
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1498
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1339/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	908/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	878/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	695/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1130/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	532/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	789/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	424/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	412/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	623/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	284/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1029/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1096/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	818/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	381/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	58/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.65	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	75/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	72/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	59/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

Course Section: SCI 100 0304
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1499
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1339/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	908/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	878/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	695/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1130/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	532/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1269/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1029/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1096/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	818/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	381/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	58/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.65	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	75/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	72/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	59/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

Course Section: SCI 100 0304
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1500
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1339/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	908/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	878/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	695/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1130/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	532/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	1283/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1029/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1096/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	818/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	381/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	58/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.65	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	75/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	72/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	59/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 3						

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: READEL, KARIN (Instr. A)

Fall 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

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	0	1	2	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1666	4.88	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	687/1555	4.13	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.88	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	278/1605	4.81	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.89	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.75	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 226	4.88	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.70	4.19	4.09	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.81	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.78	4.15	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Fall 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

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	0	1	2	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1666	4.88	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	687/1555	4.13	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.88	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1605	4.81	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 226	4.88	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.70	4.19	4.09	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.81	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.78	4.15	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1503
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	9	7	4.17	1026/1669	4.08	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	801/1666	4.27	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	632/1421	4.31	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	10	6	4.00	1029/1617	4.12	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	9	5	4.00	773/1555	3.72	3.69	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	700/1543	4.16	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	583/1647	4.31	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	1030/1668	4.85	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	525/1605	4.19	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	408/1514	4.78	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	677/1551	4.87	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	76/1503	4.69	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	340/1506	4.60	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	179/1311	4.69	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	675/1490	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	873/1502	4.16	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	753/1489	4.49	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	5	2	9	4.06	469/1006	4.03	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	70/ 226	4.67	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	58/ 233	4.67	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	81/ 225	4.81	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	106/ 223	4.66	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.53	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	52/ 206	4.60	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1503
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1504
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	7	4	7	4.00	1173/1669	4.08	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	922/1666	4.27	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	886/1421	4.31	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	821/1617	4.12	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1280/1555	3.72	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	819/1543	4.16	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	948/1647	4.31	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.85	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	918/1605	4.19	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	408/1514	4.78	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	567/1551	4.87	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	653/1503	4.69	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	718/1506	4.60	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	179/1311	4.69	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	786/1490	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	990/1502	4.16	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	657/1489	4.49	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	479/1006	4.03	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	44/ 226	4.67	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.79	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	71/ 233	4.67	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	64/ 225	4.81	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	64/ 223	4.66	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	76/ 206	4.60	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

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