Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI

Enrollment: 18

LS, DANI Fall 2006

Page 1487 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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	1 91	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			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	4.24	4.17	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	1	10	4.31		4.09	4.20	3.85		4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	U	U	U	5	Т	10	4.31	405/1311	4.09	4.20	3.05	3.00	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		4.91	54/ 225	4.79	4.70	4.19		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		4.64
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		4.55
J. Were requirements for rab reports crearry specified	,	U	U		U	2	O	4.55	70/ 200	1.//	4.70	4.13	4.01	1.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 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		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 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		,	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
1. 111 John College Tow Carry Out From acceptance		0	3	3	3	,	_	3.00	, 50			1.33	1.50	
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		****/ 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	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI

Enrollment:

20 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2006

Page 1488 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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 learn	ed 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 effectivene	ss 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			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 understandin	g 0	0	2	0	2	1	12	4.24	458/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.24
Discussion	_			_	_	_	_		0.40./4.400					
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		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 discussio		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
T - 12														
Laboratory	1	0	0	-1	1	2	11	4 50	77/006	4 54	4 50	4 00	2 00	4 50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	3	11		77/ 226	4.54		4.20	3.98	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati		•	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 activitie		0	1	0	0	0 2		4.73	86/ 225	4.79		4.50	4.42	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	14 13	4.88	47/ 223 42/ 206	4.77 4.77	4.78 4.78	4.35	4.19 4.01	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	U	U	U	U	3	13	4.81	42/ 206	4.//	4./8	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 attentio		1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0103 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1489

Ctudant	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Ougetion	פתופחו

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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
. 3														
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
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-		_	
				2	0						

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI

Enrollment: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1490 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fr	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain new	insights,ski	lls 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	instructo	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	1	0	2	0	1	3	11	4.24	908/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.24
	_	stions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	417/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.65
		tions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	821/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.24
	_	-		hat you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	996/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.83
		-		what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	969/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.94
		system clearly		nea	1	0	2	0	0	6 0	9 18	4.18	940/1647	4.45 4.93	4.48	4.12	4.06 4.62	4.18 5.00
	-	as class cance ade the overa		ing effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1/1668 918/1605	4.93	4.91 4.22	4.67 4.07		4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instruct	tor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	308/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.83
2. Did the	instructo	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	705/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.83
		_		plained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	510/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.56
		contribute to	_		0	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	496/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.65
5. Did aud	liovisual 1	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	137/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.76
		Discus																
				hat you learned	5	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00
		_	_	to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	680/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.46
				open discussion	5 5	0 1	0 1	0	1 1	2	10 6	4.69	500/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.69
4. were sp	ecial teci	nniques succe	SSIUI		5	Τ	Ţ	U	Τ	4	ь	4.17	424/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.17
1 5 1 1		Labora	-		•	0	0	-	-	_		4 44	00/006	4 54	4 50	4 00	2 00	4 44
			_	the material	0	0	0	1 0	1 0	5 4	11 14	4.44	92/ 226 48/ 233	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.44
				round information r lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.78	48/ 233 88/ 225	4.66 4.79	4.70	4.19	4.09 4.42	4.78 4.72
	_	ructor provid			0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	45/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.72
				arly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	23/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15		4.94
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	signed to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the	instructo	or available :	for indi	vidual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did res	search pro	jects contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
_		s contribute		you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	***
5. Were cr	iteria fo	r grading mad	e clear		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 1	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s 1	.4	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 7												_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti [,]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						
				3 0														

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Questions

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI

Enrollment: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1491 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

University of Maryland

1 3		Genera			_					_			=======================================					
-	_	w insights,ski			1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	769/166		4.03		4.02	4.38
		tor make clear estions reflec			1 1	0	0	1	1 1	5 8	9 7	4.38	727/166 710/142		4.45	4.19 4.24	$4.11 \\ 4.11$	4.38 4.38
		estions reflect ations reflect			1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.38	801/161			4.24	3.99	4.38
			_	what you learned	2	1	0	1	1 5	3	5	3.86	,			4.15	3.99	3.86
				what you learned		0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	723/154				3.86	4.20
		signments contr system clearl		_	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33				4.12	4.06	4.33
	-	was class canc		inea	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/166			4.67	4.62	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27			4.22			
		Lectur	0															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	441/151	4 4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.75
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94				4.66	4.55	4.94
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63				4.24		4.63
		s contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56				4.26	4.17	4.56
			_	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	264/131	1 4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.50
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cla	agg diga:			what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	4	4	3 54	1142/149	0 3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.54
				d to participate	4	0	1	1	3	2	6		1154/150				4.06	3.85
		-	_	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	5	1	7	4.15	- ,		4.57			4.15
		chniques succe		open arbeabbion	4	1	0	0	2	5	5		381/100		4.30		3.81	
		T alaassa	.															
1. Did the	e lab inc	Labora rease understa:	-	the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	66/ 22	6 4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.58
			_	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	51/ 23			4.19	4.09	4.75
				or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	68/ 22	5 4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.83
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	55/ 22	3 4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.83
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	47/ 20	6 4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper			nat you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	8 ****	****	4.22	4.00	****
	_			ation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	2 ****	****	4.06	3.81	***
_	_	could you disc			16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	0 ****	****	3.97	4.00	***
5. Did con	nferences	help you carr	y out fi	ield activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	0 ****	****	4.33	4.30	****
				Frequ	uency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.O.	asons	,			Tr.	уре			Majors	,
		Cuiii. GFA		Expected Grades						- 								,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	1	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		_	_						3					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	Τ				0	Under-	grad	17	Non-	-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								0		34	-1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0			there		_	Jn
				P 0		O+ 3	h =					_	respon	ses to	be sign	nilcar	10	
				3 0 I 0		Oti	her					6						
				? 0														

Course Section: SCI 100 0201 Un Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY ructor: READEL, KARIN

Instructor: READ
Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1492 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did vo	nı dain ne	ew insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	7	4 00	1173/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	549/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.50
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	441/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.63
	_	ations reflect		=	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.50
				what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	4	4		1170/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.62
				o what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	895/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.00
		system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	697/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.38
		was class cance	-		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	12	2	4.07	877/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.07
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures	s 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 th	ne instruc	ctor seem intere	ested i	n 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 le	ecture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	438/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.63
4. Did th	ne lecture	es 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 au	udiovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	312/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.44
		Discuss	sion															
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	849/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	836/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.32
		_		d 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 s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	209/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.57
		Laborat	_															
		crease understar	_		0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	94/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.44
_	_	_		ground information	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	51/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.75
	_			or lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	83/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.75
		structor provide			0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	93/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.63
. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75
_		Semina							_									
l. Were a	assigned t	copics relevant	to the	announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	ре			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s 1		Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 8						-						_		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					1						
				2 1														

1

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1493 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	1001/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	4.19
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	483/1666		4.45	4.19	4.11	4.56
		estions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	502/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.56
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.50
				what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	773/1555		3.69	4.00	3.92	4.00
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	543/1543		4.01	4.06	3.86	4.38
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	281/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.69
		was class cance	_	inca	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	789/1605		4.22	4.07	3.96	4.17
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	132/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.93
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.87
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.87			4.68	4.24	4.17	4.87
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506		4.58	4.26	4.17	4.73
			_	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	219/1311				3.68	4.60
5. Did au	.aiovisuai	techniques em	lance yo	our understanding	1	U	U	U	U	О	9	4.60	219/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.08	4.60
1 5 1	7.	Discuss			0		0	0			_	4 1 4	EEO /1400	2 05	4 0 4	4 05	2 05	4 1 4
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	778/1490		4.04	4.05	3.85	4.14
				d to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	754/1502		4.32	4.26	4.06	4.40
		_		d 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 s	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	376/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.27
		Laborat	_															
		rease understar			2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	67/ 226		4.59	4.20	3.98	4.57
				ground information	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	80/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.57
	_			or lab activities	3	0	0	0	0		11	4.85	66/ 225	4.79	4.81	4.50	4.42	4.85
		tructor provide			2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	64/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.79
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	40/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.86
		Seminar																
				announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5		_		,				0		, .	_			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - :				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					2						

? 0

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1494 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	7		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 1	8 15	3.94	981/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86 4.06	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15 15	4.94	78/1647 499/1668	4.45 4.93	4.48 4.91	4.12 4.67	4.06	4.94 4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	4	15 5	4.40	499/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.40
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	_	U	U		4	5	4.40	499/1003	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.90	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		4.57	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		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	****
mini a manda														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1 -	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 58	****	****	4 00	4 00	****
	15				-	-	1		,	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation 	15 15	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 52 ****/ 39	****	****	4.06	3.81 4.30	****
	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.39 3.97		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15 15	0	0	0	U T	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid accivities	13	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 30			4.33	4.30	

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title SHECKELLS, DANI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1495 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	6	3	4	2 20	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	3 7	8	3.28 4.17	984/1666	4.41	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.28 4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	o 5		1100/1421	4.41	4.43	4.19	4.11	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	1	0	5		5		1212/1617	4.37	4.43	4.24	3.99	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 1	2	1	4	4	6 5	2		1389/1555	3.63	3.69	4.15	3.99	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	8	2	5		1232/1543		4.01	4.06	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4		4.44		4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	16		428/1668	4.93		4.12		4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	918/1605	4.13		4.07	3.96	4.00
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	O	Ü	_	2	5	-	1.00	J10/1005	1.15	1.22	1.07	3.50	1.00
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		1069/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26		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		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
									,					
Self Paced	1.0		0		-	0	0	2 02		ale ale ale a	ale ale ale a	4 24	4 15	de de de de
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		****/ 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	****

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DAM

SHECKELLS, DANI Fall 2006

Page 1495 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title SHECKELLS, DANI

Instructor: Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11 Fall 2006

Page 1496 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Zacpatoup														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	2	4		1423/1669		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		4.45	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			4.24	4.11	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0 1	4	6 4	2		1268/1617 1155/1555		4.32	4.15	3.99 3.92	3.73 3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	2		1246/1543		4.01	4.06	3.86	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	4		997/1647		4.48	4.12	4.06	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	8		1125/1668			4.67	4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	1		1210/1605					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		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	4.26	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			4.81	4.50	4.42	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0 1	0	1	0	8	4.78 4.56	65/ 223 69/ 206		4.78	4.35	4.19	4.78 4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	U	1	U	U	U	8	4.50	69/ 206	4.//	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.50
Seminar	1.0	•	1	0	0	0	0	1 00		de de de de	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 0 4	de de de de
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10 10	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ 97 ****/ 92	****	****	4.36 4.22	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0 1	0	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.22	3.79 3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 98		****	3.95	3.94	****
5. Were effected for grading made effect	10	O	_	O	Ü	Ü	O	1.00	, 50			3.75	3.50	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0			****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	1.0	^	0	1	0	0	^	2 22	****	****	****	4 24	A 10	****
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 10	0	1 0	0 1	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45 4.25	4.26 4.25	****
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students 	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
J. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	T ()	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 29			7.37	7.44	

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course Section: SCI 100 0303 University of Maryland Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Baltimore County

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1497 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eque:	ncie	:S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	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
1 5	for 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
	estions 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
_	ations 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
	dings 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
9	gnments contribute to what you learne		0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1043/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88
	system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	600/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.44
	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 gr	ade the overall teaching effectivenes	ss 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 instruc	ctor'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
	for 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
	erial 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
	s 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
	techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	445/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.25
1 544 43.44 44.44	Discussion	-	0	^	1	_	4	4	4 00	0.40 /1.400	2 05	4 0 4	4 05	2 05	4 00
	ssions contribute to what you learned as actively encouraged to participate	5 5	0	0	0	2	2	4 7	4.00	849/1490 693/1502	3.95 4.32	4.04	4.05 4.26	3.85	4.00
	or encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	2	3	6	4.45	837/1489	4.52	4.52	4.20	4.06 4.07	4.45 4.36
4. Were special ted	-	1 5 5	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	413/1006	4.31	4.30	4.29	3.81	4.18
4. Were special tec	miiques successiui	5	U	U	Τ.	4	4	0	4.10	413/1000	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.01	4.10
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab incr	rease 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 provide	ed with adequate background information	n 2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	71/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.64
3. Were necessary m	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 inst	ructor 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 requirement	s 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
	Fre	quency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Consider Brown	Guy GDA Buyantal Guyla	_			ъ.		_							M	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			ке	ason	ເຮ			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				2	0						

Course Section: SCI 100 0304 University of Maryland Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI (Instr. A) Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1498 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

~								~										
								-	ncies				tructor	Course	-		Level	Se
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Me
		General	 l															
. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1339/1669	3.96	4.03	4.23	4.02	3.
. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	908/1666	4.41	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.
. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	878/1421	4.37	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.
Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	695/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.
				what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.63	3.69	4.00	3.92	3.
Did wr	ritten as:	signments contri	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1130/1543	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	532/1647	4.45	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.
		was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.
				ching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	789/1605	4.13	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.
		Lecture	2															
Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	424/1514	4.82	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.
Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.
Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	412/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4
Did th	ne lecture	es 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 .
Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	284/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	2
		Discuss	sion															
Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ate to	what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1029/1490	3.95	4.04	4.05	3.85	3.
Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	3	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1096/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.
Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	fair ar	nd open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	818/1489	4.52	4.57	4.29	4.07	4 .
Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful		4	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	381/1006	4.31	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.
		Laborat	-															
		crease understar			0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	58/ 226	4.54	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.
_	_	_		kground information	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	75/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.
				for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0		13	4.81	72/ 225		4.81	4.50		4.
		structor provide			1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	59/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.
Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts c	learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 jor	s 1	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
8-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 8			_			_						,		
6-83	-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	1
84-150	-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																-	
rad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	t enoug	gh
				Р 0									respons				_	
				I O		Otl	ner					1	-		3			
				2 2			-											

3

Course Section: SCI 100 0304 University of Maryland

Page 1499 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment:	20	
Questionnaires:	17	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre		ncies	2		Tnat	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
	General															
1. Did you gain new		com 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 instructo			0	0	0	0	4	5	8		908/1666		4.45	4.19		4.24
3. Did the exam ques		_	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18			4.43	4.24	4.11	4.18
4. Did other evaluat		_	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	695/1617	4.29	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.35
5. Did assigned read	lings 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 assig	nments 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 s	ystem clearly expl	ained	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 wa	s 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 gra	de the overall tea	ching 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 instruct	or'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 instructo			16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.82
3. Was lecture mater			16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	4.65	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.65
			16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	4.55	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.53
5. Did audiovisual t	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan				3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1269/1311	4.09	4.20	3.85	3.68	2.76
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	ions 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		_	3	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1096/1502	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.93
3. Did the instructo	r encourage fair a	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 tech	niques 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 incre		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			1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	75/ 233	4.66	4.70	4.19	4.09	4.63
3. Were necessary ma			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 instr	uctor provide assi	stance	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	59/ 223	4.77	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.81
5. Were requirements	clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	47/ 206	4.77	4.78	4.15	4.01	4.75	
		Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	s			Ty	pe			Majors	.	
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected							- 								

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

Course Section: SCI 100 0304 University of Maryland Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1500

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2006
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									

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

Course Section: SCI 100H 0101 University of Maryland

Enrollment:

9

Page 1501 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: READEL, KARIN (Instr. A)

Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---

Quebeloini	iaiics.	O		Beddelle ede	ii bC	Буат	uaci	J11 Q	20001	. 011110	<i>1</i> 11 C	•						
							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1666	4.88	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.88
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the e	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 ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute t	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
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.88	4.48	4.12	4.06	4.88
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	all tead	ching 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 t	he instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.82	4.39	4.32	4.88		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551		4.89	4.66	4.55	5.00
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.24	4.17	5.00
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.58	4.26	4.17	4.88
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.75	4.20	3.85	3.68	4.75
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.50
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502		4.32	4.26	4.06	4.50
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.07	5.00
		echniques succe		-	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.50
		Labora	atory															
1 Did th	e lah ind			of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 226	4.88	4.59	4.20	3.98	4.88
				ground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 233		4.70	4.19	4.09	5.00
_	_	_		for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 225		4.81	4.50	4.42	5.00
	_	structor provid			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223		4.78	4.35	4.19	5.00
		_		learly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206			4.15		5.00
	Fre					7 Dist	tri b	ıti o	2									
					iency	DIS	CIID	uc10	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6				Required for Major				jors	3	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo)r	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8
04 1 5 0	_	2 00 2 40	^															

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course Section: SCI 100H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1502 JAN 18, 2007 Title

Baltimore County

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

11010			20202020	oouroj	
Instructor:		(Instr. B)	Fall	2006	
Enrollment:	9				
Questionnaires:	8	Studer	nt Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire	Э

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 5

Ρ

I

?

0

0

					Frequencies Inst					G	Domb	IIMDO	T 1	0.55				
		Ouestion	a		NR	NA	1	eque. 2	3	Δ	5	Mean	Rank	Course	Mean	Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om 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 instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected 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 q	uestions reflec	t 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 eval	uations reflect	the ex	kpected 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 r	eadings contrib	ute 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 as	signments contr	ibute 1	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 gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	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 cand	elled		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 overa	.ll tead	ching 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	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.04	4.05	3.85	4.50
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd 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 t	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.30	4.00	3.81	4.50
		Labora	tory															
1. Did	the lab in	crease understa	nding o	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 provi	ded with adequa	te bacl	ground 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 avai	lable :	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 in	structor provid	le assi	stance	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.19	5.00
5. Were	e requireme	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.78	4.15	4.01	5.00
	Fre					Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades												Ty	pe			Majors	:
										- – – -								
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera.	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

0

Other

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 19

TN Fall 2006

Page 1503 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Frequencies Ir			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		****/ 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		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 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	1.0	0	0	0	_	-	_	4 60		also also also also	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 00	ate ate ate ate
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 58	****		4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 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		****/ 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	****
0.16 7. 1														
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	****/ 55	****	****	1 21	1 17	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	-	1	2		,			4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1 1	0	2	4.33	****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16 16	0	0	0	0 T	1	_		****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25	$4.25 \\ 4.22$	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	тρ	U	U	U	U	Т	۷	4.0/	/ 29			4.34	4.22	

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County READEL, KARIN Fall 2006

Page 1503 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6 6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	•	0	0	•	_		_	4 00	1100/1660	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0 1	7 2	4 7	9	4.00	1173/1669 922/1666	4.08	4.03 4.45	4.23	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.22	886/1421	4.27 4.31		4.19 4.24	4.11 4.11	4.22 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		1280/1555	3.72	3.69	4.13	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		4.67	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		4.07		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		4.29	4.07	
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		****/ 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	***

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ther	e are not enougl	n

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