Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Instructor:

Enrollment:

STAFF (Instr. A)

20 Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1454 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	3	8	2 76	1352/1639	3.63	2 67	4.27	4.08	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	o 7		1421/1639	3.85	3.86	4.27	4.08	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	4	4		1351/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	6		1338/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	3	3		1195/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	6		1129/1504		3.66	4.05	3.78	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	837/1612		3.95	4.16	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	2	0	0	4	1	3.29	1409/1579		3.55	4.08	3.95	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	863/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	11		1060/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	779/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	5	6		1144/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	1	0	1	8	4.00	623/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1074/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	0	2	5	3.60	1192/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1157/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	682/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	69/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	71/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	43/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	42/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.07	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1454 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY MERES

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Fall 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1455

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	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	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1352/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	7	3.65	1421/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	4	4	3.12	1351/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	6	3.65	1338/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1195/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	6	3.65	1129/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	837/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1318/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.39
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	10	0	0	0	2	1	4		1069/1518	4.44		4.43	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	4		1033/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	3			973/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	2			1385/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	529/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.08
Discussion	_			_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	3	4		1074/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	0	2	5		1192/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	1	1	5		1157/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	682/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	69/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	5		71/ 240			4.10		4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1		4.57 4.86	43/ 219	4.51 4.78	4.42	4.11	4.01 4.44	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1		4.86		4.75	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.86	42/ 215 16/ 198	4.75	4.68 4.60	4.35	4.43	4.86
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	10	U	U	U	U	Τ.	0	4.00	10/ 198	4.03	4.00	4.10	4.23	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 17 Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1455 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1456 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Evaluation	()11ect 101	nnaire

				equei	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	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1378/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	5		1193/1639		3.86	4.22	4.17	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	3	4	3.44	1287/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	929/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1399/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	6	2	3.39	1271/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	718/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1102/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	708/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	11		1060/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1016/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	11	2	3.71	1259/1550		4.03	4.22	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	746/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	840/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	959/1391		3.93	4.30	4.07	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	944/1388	3.94		4.28	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	590/ 958			3.93	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	48/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.59
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	60/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	87/ 219		4.70	4.44	4.44	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	79/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	18/ 198			4.18	4.25	4.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82	***	****	4.52	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53		3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42		5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37		5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		****	4.56	4.60	****
				-	-	-	_		, 32					
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1457 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	977/1639	3.63	3.67		4.08	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	926/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	954/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.53	455/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	942/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	478/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	694/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635		4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1155/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.10
T a whoma														
Lecture	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	1 00	206/1510	1 11	1 11	4 42	4.38	4.93
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	<i>5</i>	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.86	286/1518	4.44	4.41			
								4.83	725/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	405/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	832/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	586/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	494/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	854/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/ 958		3.79	3.93	3.71	4.83
i. Were special teeimiques successial	10	_	O	O	O	_	,	1.05	J1/ J30	3.00	3.75	3.73	3.71	1.05
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	112/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	57/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	79/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	56/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	***	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1457 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6 6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

ni. SCI 100 0103

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Instructor: MERES
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1458 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 43 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.69 4.69 \*\*\*\*

0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 21 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.52 5.00 \*\*\*\*

16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.37 4.67 \*\*\*\*

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	977/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	926/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	954/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	455/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	942/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	478/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	694/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	494/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	854/1388		3.91		4.01	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	112/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	57/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	79/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	56/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	***	****	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	***	****	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
		_	_	_	_	_								

16 0 0

16 0 0

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County . B) Fall 2007

Page 1458 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18

Title

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1459 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies			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	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	1055/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	1003/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	7	4		1190/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	7		751/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	9	1		1206/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	3.94		3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	7		1044/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	16		766/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1022/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.92
Lecture	_		_						005/4540					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	807/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	3	10		1331/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	956/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	638/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	595/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	4	2	2 67	1030/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	903/1391	4.02	3.72	4.30	4.07	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	2	2		1056/1388	3.94	3.93	4.28	4.01	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	841/ 958			3.93		3.00
4. Were special techniques successium	11	1	2	Т	U	1	2	3.00	041/ 950	3.00	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	103/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	109/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	75/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.40
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
. 16 - 1														
Self Paced	1	^	0	0	0	7	^	4 00	****	4.4.4.4.	الدائد الماليات	4 45	4 - 4	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	***	****	4.52	5.00	* * * *

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1459 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to 1	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1460

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

3 3 8 4.20 667/1504 3.66 3.66 4.05 3.78 4.20

1/1635 4.93 4.90 4.65 4.56 5.00

3 2 5 6 3.88 1198/1612 3.97 3.95 4.16 4.10 3.88

0 2 9 2 4.00 889/1579 3.52 3.55 4.08 3.95 3.92

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Title Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19

Ouestionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor 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 0 6 3.81 1318/1639 3.63 3.67 4.27 4.08 3.81 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 6 4 6 4.00 1090/1639 3.85 3.86 4.22 4.17 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 1 6 1 6 3.67 1219/1397 3.61 3.64 4.28 4.18 3.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 8 5 4.06 967/1583 3.94 3.95 4.19 4.01 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 1 4 1 4 3.33 1330/1532 3.19 3.20 4.01 3.88 3.33

0

0 0 0

1

0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00

Lecture

7. Was the grading system clearly explained

8. How many times was class cancelled

6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 Ω Ω 1 1 12 4.79 397/1518 4.44 4.41 4.43 4.38 4.39 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 1033/1520 4.66 4.63 4.70 4.61 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 462/1517 4.27 4.25 4.27 4.20 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 1 4 7 4.31 860/1550 4.03 4.03 4.22 4.17 4.05 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.46 297/1295 4.11 4.10 3.94 3.84 4.33

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3.75 965/1398 3.75 3.72 4.07 3.85 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 1 4 3.75 1146/1391 4.02 3.93 4.30 4.07 3.75 9 0 1 0 3 3 4.14 897/1388 3.94 3.91 4.28 4.01 4.14 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 9 2 0 1 0 3 3.80 577/ 958 3.80 3.79 3.93 3.71 3.80

Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 2 4 10 4.50 51/ 224 4.46 4.39 4.10 3.90 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 64/ 240 4.51 4.42 4.11 4.01 4.63 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 49/ 219 4.78 4.70 4.44 4.44 4.81 0 0 3 13 4.81 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 49/ 215 4.75 4.68 4.35 4.43 4.81 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 35/ 198 4.63 4.60 4.18 4.25 4.69

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-	_	-	
					0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105 University of Maryland WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Baltimore County

Title Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1461 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		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	2	5	3	6	3.81	1318/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1090/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	1	6	3.67	1219/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	967/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1330/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	667/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1198/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1109/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1223/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1215/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	505/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1146/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	897/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	64/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	49/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	35/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.69
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	4	-		-	
				2	Λ						

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title

Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1462 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
**************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	6	3.94	1206/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	840/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	722/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	822/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1069/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	958/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	656/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	706/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	889/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	435/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	597/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	428/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	13	4.28	882/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	0	1	13	4.41	337/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	2	10	4.20	675/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	1	11	4.40	694/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	647/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	107/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.79
Laboratory	_	_	_											
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	26/ 224		4.39	4.10	3.90	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	62/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	68/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	42/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.47	3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	14	U	U	U	U	4	4	4.50	/ 62			4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	22/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	4.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	14/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	4.80
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	10	_	J	J	J	J	-	5.00	, 32			1.50	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
<u> </u>														

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County READEL, KARIN Fall 2007

Page 1462 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

READEL, KARIN Fall 2007

Page 1463 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	5	4	3.53	1488/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	4	6	3.94	1193/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	813/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	862/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	6	2	3		1399/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	2	7		1003/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	965/1612	3.97		4.16	4.10	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	4	9			1270/1579			4.08		3.60
J. now would you grade the overall teaching critetiveness	_	_	-	Ü	-		_	3.00	12/0/13/3	3.32	3.33	1.00	3.75	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4 13	1189/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2		4.75	890/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	758/1517	4.27		4.27	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	-		1010/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	561/1295		4.10			4.13
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	U	4	3	4	2	4.13	301/1293	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.04	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	950/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	678/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	721/1388		3.91	4.28	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3		4.50	201/ 958		3.79		3.71	
4. Were special techniques successium	10	_	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	201/ 936	3.00	3.13	3.93	3.71	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	97/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	123/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	97/ 219	4.78		4.44	4.44	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	85/ 215	4.75		4.35		4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	29/ 198	4.73	4.60			4.73
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	O	U	U	U	Τ	Т	9	4.73	29/ 190	4.03	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.73
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.47	3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 02			4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37				5.00	****
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	Тρ	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	/ 3/	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did Study questions make treat the expected goal	Τ0	U	U	U	U	т	U	4.00	/ 34		· · · · · ·	±.51	1.0/	

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County READEL, KARIN Fall 2007

Page 1463 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title WATER; INTERDI Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

READEL, KARIN Fall 2007

Page 1464 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	mier	cies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	3	5	6	3.35	1541/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	1052/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1029/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	5	9	3.85	1192/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	1195/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	7	6	3.50	1212/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	3	3	7	3.30	1461/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	1	8	1	0	2.54	1552/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.54
Lecture	_	_	_	_		_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	807/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	8	9		1286/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	5		4.41	713/1517	4.27		4.27	4.20	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	1	3	8		1274/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	4	2	9	3.94	687/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	770/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	816/1391	4.02	3.72	4.30	4.07	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	647/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	3	1		4.36	290/ 958		3.79		3.71	4.36
4. Were special techniques successivi	,	U	U	U	5	_	,	1.50	290/ 930	3.00	3.19	3.93	3.71	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	80/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4		4.73	73/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	40/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.87
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	41/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ [2	4 00	2 00	1 0 1	2 (1	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19				0	1	0		****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	5.00 ***	5.00 ***	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	^ ^ ^ ^	* * * * *	4.56	4.60	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1464 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

J3UL UNIVERSITY OF MA

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: MERES
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1465 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
---------	--------	------------	---------------	--

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	6	3.88	1266/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1090/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	7	3.88	1099/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	881/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	981/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	824/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	965/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1214/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	629/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	328/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	779/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	3	8		1048/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	451/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94		4.27
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	U	U	U	3	5	,	4.2/	451/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.04	4.2/
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	4	1		1171/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	983/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	944/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	399/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	120/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	89/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3		4.79	57/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44		4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46		4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	91/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18		4.31
Seminar														
	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.50	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0		4.00	****/ 78	****	****		4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1 1		****/ 80	****	****	$4.47 \\ 4.47$	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
5. Were Criteria for grading made crear	10	U	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	/ 62			4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
		-	-	-	-	-	_		,					

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: MERES
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1465 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1466 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	_	0	_			2 05	1565/1620	2 62	2 68	4 05	4 00	2 05
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	3	4	4		1565/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	•	1		3	5	4		1481/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	7	3		1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	4	4		1394/1583		3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	2	0	2		1516/1532		3.20	4.01	3.88	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	3	3		1401/1504		3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	5	5		1349/1612		3.95	4.16	4.10	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2			721/1635		4.90	4.65	4.56	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	6	2	0	2.80	1525/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1213/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1136/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1083/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1344/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	545/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	863/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	740/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.07	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 958		3.79	3.93	3.71	****
4. Were special techniques successiul	11	2	U	U	U		4	4.07	/ 930	3.00	3.19	3.93	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	88/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	76/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	51/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	97/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.2
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	***	****	4.16	3.90	***
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	***
Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Po	2502	c			т.	ne			Majors	
creates marned cum GPA Expected Grades					ason:	5 			Ту	 he			majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor:

20

MERES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1467 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

		0		NTD	377		_	ncies		_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions		NR 	NA 	1 	2	3 	4	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		General															
_	_	ew insights,skills fr		0	0	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1565/1639		3.67	4.27	4.08	3.25
		ctor make clear the $\epsilon$		0	0	1	3	3	5	4		1481/1639		3.86	4.22	4.17	3.50
	_	uestions reflect the		0	0	3	0	3	7	3		1290/1397		3.64	4.28	4.18	3.4
		uations reflect the $\epsilon$		1	0	1	2	4	4	4		1394/1583		3.95	4.19	4.01	3.5
	_	eadings contribute to	_	0	4	5	3	2	0	2		1516/1532		3.20	4.01	3.88	2.2
		signments contribute	_	0	0	3	2	5	3	3		1401/1504		3.66	4.05	3.78	3.0
	_	g system clearly expl	ained	0	0 1	1	3	2	5 2	5 13		1349/1612		3.95	4.16	4.10	3.6
	_	was class cancelled grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	2	13		721/1635 ****/1579			4.65 4.08	4.56 3.95	2.8
. 11011 110	ara you	grade one everall eee	oning cricocryoness		Ü	Ü	Ü	_	-	ŭ	3.07	, 13.75	3.32	3.33	1.00	3.75	2.0
		Lecture	1	1.0	0	•	-	•	-	0	4 00	1005/1510		4 43	4 42	4 20	4 0
		uctor's lectures well		12	0	0	1	0	1	2		1237/1518		4.41	4.43	4.38	4.0
		ctor seem interested	_	12	0	0	0	1	0	3		1188/1520		4.63	4.70	4.61	4.5
		terial presented and	-	12	0	0	1	0	1	2		1083/1517		4.25	4.27	4.20	4.0
		es contribute to what	_	10	2	0	0	1 0	0 1	3		638/1550		4.03		4.17	3.9
. Did au	alovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	12	U	U	U	U	Τ	3	4./5	135/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.4
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	_	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/1398		3.72	4.07	3.85	4.0
		ed to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	863/1391		3.93	4.30	4.07	4.2	
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	740/1388		3.91	4.28	4.01	4.4
. Were s	pecial t	echniques successful		11	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	***
		Laboratory															
		crease understanding		1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	88/ 224		4.39	4.10	3.90	4.3
		ded with adequate bac		1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	76/ 240		4.42	4.11	4.01	4.5
		materials available		1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	51/ 219		4.70	4.44	4.44	4.8
		structor provide assi nts for lab reports o		1	0	0	0 1	0 3	1 2	14 9	4.93 4.27	23/ 215 97/ 198		4.68	4.35	4.43	4.9
. were r	equireme.	nts for lab reports (	rearry specified	1	U	U	Т	3	2	9	4.2/	9// 198	4.03	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.2
		Seminar								_							
	_	topics relevant to th		15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85		****	4.58	4.50	***
		ctor available for in		15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82			4.52	4.12	
	_	rojects contribute to	_	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78		****	4.47	4.25	***
_		ons contribute to wha	-	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	,	****	4.47	4.39	***
. were c	riteria	for grading made clea	r	15	0	0	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 82		^ ^ ^ ^	4.16	3.90	
	-	Field Work								_							
. Dia co	nierence	s help you carry out	field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	***
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	тре			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	 A 5		 Re	 muir	 ed f	 or Ma	ior	 g 1	 3	 Graduat	·	 0	 Мајо	 or	 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		1/6	darr	cu I	OI MG	יייני	D I		Graduat		J	Majo	<i>)</i> <u> </u>	U
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-c	rad 1	L6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		00.	u	_				-	011401 9	,		2,011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	gh
•			P 0									respons				_	•
			I 0		Ot:	her					3	-					

0 ?

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1468 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	1		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	5	3	3.44	1520/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1281/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1261/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	5	4	0	3.08	1411/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	5	6	1	3.33	1303/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	5	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	510/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	776/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5		4.25	886/1517	4.27		4.27	4.20	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4		4.27	882/1550	4.03		4.22	4.17	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	911/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.89
Discussion	_	_				_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	7	1		1002/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	3		1124/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	5	2		1143/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	794/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.30
T - b														
Laboratory	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	1 (1	45/ 224	1 10	4 20	1 10	2 00	1 (1
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0			1 1	2	8 7	4.64	- ,	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5 5	0	0	0	1	3 1	9	4.55 4.73	75/ 240 76/ 219	4.51 4.78	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.55 4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5 5	0									4.70	4.44	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5 5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	68/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	U	U	U	1	1	9	4.73	29/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.47	3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 62			4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 37	3.00	3.00	1.50	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
The state of the s		-	-	-	_	-	_	00	, 51					

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: STAFF

Enrollment: 18

Baltimore County (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Page 1468 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	0						

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY (Instr. B)

Instructor: MERES

18

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1469 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		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	4	4	5	3	3.44	1520/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1281/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1261/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	5	4	0		1411/1532		3.20	4.01	3.88	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	5	6	1		1303/1504		3.66	4.05	3.78	3.33
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	4	2	5	4		1360/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1			463/1635	4.93		4.65		4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1375/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1334/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	3	4		1136/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1077/1550		4.03	4.22	4.17	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14		4.11		3.94	3.84	
									,					
Discussion	_		_		_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	7	1		1002/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	3		1124/1391		3.93	4.30		3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	5	2		1143/1388		3.91	4.28		3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	794/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	45/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	75/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	68/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	29/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	***
Field Work	1 =	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ []	1 00	2 00	1 01	2 61	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15					1	-		****/ 52 ****/ 53	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0		U T	0	4.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	U	U	1	U	0	3.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1469 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Page 1470 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	6	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	4	4	3.26	1550/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	2	3.00	1363/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1398/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	4	2	2	0		1520/1532		3.20	4.01	3.88	2.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	8	2	2		1401/1504		3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	0	0	0	8	3			1190/1612		3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1				811/1635		4.90	4.65	4.56	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	1	9	2	0	2.67	1541/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	5	8	4 06	1220/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	9		1247/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	5	6	3		1380/1517		4.03	4.70	4.20	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	1	4	5	2		1426/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	2	4	3			1117/1295			3.94	3.84	3.39
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	J	2	2	2	7	5	J	3.21	111//12/3	7.11	1.10	3.94	3.01	3.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1322/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1220/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1350/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	910/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	2.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	74/ 224		4.39	4.10	3.90	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0		12		51/ 219		4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	40/ 215		4.68	4.35	4.43	4.87
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	19/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
3 3														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced	1.0	^		-	_		-	2 50	****	التناد التي التي	الدائد الماليات	4 45	4 - 4	اد داد بای بای
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50		***	***	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	, -	***	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50		****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	U	U	U	U	1	Τ	4.50	****/ 21			4.52	5.00	

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: STAFF

Enrollment:

Baltimore County (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Page 1470 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

19 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title

Instructor: MERES

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

# Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1471

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	auer	cies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	6	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	4	4	3.26	1550/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	2	3.00	1363/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1398/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	4	2	2	0	2.08	1520/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	8	2	2	3.06	1401/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1190/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	811/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	529/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1188/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	973/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	972/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	943/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	3	3	1	2 82	1322/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	3	3		1220/1391	4.02	3.72	4.30	4.07	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	4	1	1		1350/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	2	1	1	_		910/ 958		3.79		3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	,	J	2	2	1		1	2.57	J10/ J30	3.00	3.75	3.95	3.71	2.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	74/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	51/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	40/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.87
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	19/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
5. Pla comperences neigh for cally one field deciving		ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 32			1.50	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1471 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Title WATER: INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 18
Ouestionnaires: 18

## Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1472

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 3 3 4 6 3.81 1318/1639 3.81 3.67 4.27 4.08 3.81 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 3 3 10 4.44 633/1639 4.44 3.86 4.22 4.17 4.44 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 1 3 4 8 4.19 859/1397 4.19 3.64 4.28 4.18 4.19 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 1 1 5 9 4.38 640/1583 4.38 3.95 4.19 4.01 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 1 6 2 5 3.79 1012/1532 3.79 3.20 4.01 3.88 3.79 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 4 4 6 4.00 824/1504 4.00 3.66 4.05 3.78 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.80 166/1612 4.80 3.95 4.16 4.10 4.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.90 4.65 4.56 4.739. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 2 1 5 3 3.82 1125/1579 3.82 3.55 4.08 3.95 3.82 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 745/1518 4.56 4.41 4.43 4.38 4.562. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.83 725/1520 4.83 4.63 4.70 4.61 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 2 13 4.59 498/1517 4.59 4.25 4.27 4.20 4.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 4 10 4.11 1019/1550 4.11 4.03 4.22 4.17 4.11 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 2 4 10 4.29 428/1295 4.29 4.10 3.94 3.84 4.29 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 1 2 8 4.42 502/1398 4.42 3.72 4.07 3.85 4.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 1 3 2 6 4.08 945/1391 4.08 3.93 4.30 4.07 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 2 2 9 4.29 815/1388 4.29 3.91 4.28 4.01 4.294. Were special techniques successful 6 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 91/958 4.83 3.79 3.93 3.71 4.83 Laboratory 74/ 224 4.40 4.39 4.10 3.90 4.40 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 89/240 4.47 4.42 4.11 4.01 4.47 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  $\phantom{0}$  3  $\phantom{0}$  0  $\phantom{0}$  1  $\phantom{0}$  1  $\phantom{0}$  3  $\phantom{0}$  4.80 51/ 219 4.80 4.70 4.44 4.44 4.80 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 4 9 4.40 122/ 215 4.40 4.68 4.35 4.43 4.405. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 28/198 4.73 4.60 4.18 4.25 4.73 Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.39 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.04 3.61 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.93 4.05 3.51 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation  $17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 5.00 **** / 42 **** 5.00 4.75 4.79 ****$ 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 37 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.58 5.00 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.56 4.60 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  $17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 3.00 **** / 32 **** **** 4.37 4.67 ****$ Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 11 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough

I 0 Other 3 ? 0

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Title

READEL, KARIN Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1473 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Rank		Mean Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean
General	^	0	0	1	2	4	1.0	4 40	706/1620	2 05	2 67	4 07	4.08	4 40
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4 7	12 12	4.42	726/1639 382/1639	3.85 3.73	3.67 3.86	4.27 4.22	4.08	4.42 4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	302/1039	3.73	3.64	4.22	4.17	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	347/1583	3.88	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	729/1532	3.09	3.20	4.01	3.88	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	824/1504	3.56	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	270/1612	3.57	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635		4.90	4.65	4.56	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	496/1579	3.64			3.95	4.40
mount for Senso and sensor constant									,					
Lecture		_		_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	227/1518	4.18	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	328/1520	4.35	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	263/1517	3.99	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	242/1550	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	150/1295	4.02	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	494/1398	3.25	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	616/1391	3.35	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	721/1388	3.59	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	2	3	0	9	4.14	411/ 958	3.38	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	84/ 224	3.94	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	98/ 240	3.90	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	135/ 219	4.20	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	70/ 215	4.37	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	21/ 198	4.38	4.60	4.18		4.79
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.43	3.89	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	3.50	3.93	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
4 11 5 11 1 (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1.0	_	_	_	-	_	0	2 00		also also also also	also also also also	4 25	4 60	4.4.4.4.

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.37 4.67 \*\*\*\*

Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY

Instructor: READEL, KAR

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 19

READEL, KARIN

Fall 2007

Page 1473 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Earned Cum. GF		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	sons Type			Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2007

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Title Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20 Ouestionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1474

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 3 3.57 1466/1639 3.85 3.67 4.27 4.08 3.57 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 6 4 2 3.29 1546/1639 3.73 3.86 4.22 4.17 3.29 2 5 3 2 3.07 1356/1397 3.63 3.64 4.28 4.18 3.07 3 4 4 3 3.50 1406/1583 3.88 3.95 4.19 4.01 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 4 1 2 1 2 2.60 1491/1532 3.09 3.20 4.01 3.88 2.60 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 3 1 3 4 3.33 1303/1504 3.56 3.66 4.05 3.78 3.33 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 3 3 1 3 3 3.00 1519/1612 3.57 3.95 4.16 4.10 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 968/1635 4.76 4.90 4.65 4.56 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 6 3 2 3.64 1251/1579 3.64 3.55 4.08 3.95 3.26 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 Ω 1 2 5 5 4.08 1213/1518 4.18 4.41 4.43 4.38 3.82 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 1 0 2 2 8 4.23 1363/1520 4.35 4.63 4.70 4.61 4.05 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 2 3 5 3 3.69 1283/1517 3.99 4.25 4.27 4.20 3.60 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 3 3 4 3.54 1318/1550 3.98 4.03 4.22 4.17 3.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 1 2 5 4 3.77 832/1295 4.02 4.10 3.94 3.84 3.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 3 1 1 2.67 1342/1398 3.25 3.72 4.07 3.85 2.67 1 2.78 1363/1391 3.35 3.93 4.30 4.07 2.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 2 2 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 5 2 3 2 3.17 1292/1388 3.59 3.91 4.28 4.01 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 5 1 1 4 1 1 3.00 841/958 3.38 3.79 3.93 3.71 3.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 2 2 3.73 180/ 224 3.94 4.39 4.10 3.90 3.73 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 Ω 3 5 2 3.64 198/240 3.90 4.42 4.11 4.01 3.64 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 2 3 5 4.09 175/ 219 4.20 4.70 4.44 4.44 4.09 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 1 0 1 1 3 5 4.20 137/ 215 4.37 4.68 4.35 4.43 4.20 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 5 0 4 4.18 110/ 198 4.38 4.60 4.18 4.25 4.18 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 82 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 4.52 4.12 \*\*\*\* 78 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.25 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.39 \*\*\*\* 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 82 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.16 3.90 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 4 0 2 3.43 42/ 52 3.43 3.89 4.04 3.61 3.43 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 1 3.50 41/ 53 3.50 3.93 4.05 3.51 3.50 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 1 0 1 1 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.75 4.79 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 \*\*\*\*/ 37 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.58 5.00 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.56 4.60 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned Cum.		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades			Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 2	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6	б						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F (	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	e are not enougl	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 ? 1

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102 University of Maryland

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

Baltimore County

WATER; INTERDIS STUDY Title Instructor: MERES (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 20

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1475

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 14 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 3 3.57 1466/1639 3.85 3.67 4.27 4.08 3.57 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 6 4 2 3.29 1546/1639 3.73 3.86 4.22 4.17 3.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 2
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 5 3 2 3.07 1356/1397 3.63 3.64 4.28 4.18 3.07 3 4 4 3 3.50 1406/1583 3.88 3.95 4.19 4.01 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 4 1 2 1 2 2.60 1491/1532 3.09 3.20 4.01 3.88 2.60 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 3 1 3 4 3.33 1303/1504 3.56 3.66 4.05 3.78 3.33 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 3 3 1 3 3 3.00 1519/1612 3.57 3.95 4.16 4.10 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 968/1635 4.76 4.90 4.65 4.56 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 1 2 2 3 0 2.88 1516/1579 3.64 3.55 4.08 3.95 3.26 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ο 1 2 Ω 3 3.56 1411/1518 4.18 4.41 4.43 4.38 3.82 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 1 0 2 1 4 3.88 1447/1520 4.35 4.63 4.70 4.61 4.05 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 2 3 3.50 1347/1517 3.99 4.25 4.27 4.20 3.60 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 1 2 0 0 2 3 3.57 1306/1550 3.98 4.03 4.22 4.17 3.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 3 1 3.57 943/1295 4.02 4.10 3.94 3.84 3.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 3 1 1 2.67 1342/1398 3.25 3.72 4.07 3.85 2.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 2 2 1 2.78 1363/1391 3.35 3.93 4.30 4.07 2.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 5 2 3 2 3.17 1292/1388 3.59 3.91 4.28 4.01 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 5 1 1 4 1 1 3.00 841/958 3.38 3.79 3.93 3.71 3.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 2 2 3.73 180/ 224 3.94 4.39 4.10 3.90 3.73 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 Ω 3 5 2 3.64 198/240 3.90 4.42 4.11 4.01 3.64 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 2 3 5 4.09 175/ 219 4.20 4.70 4.44 4.44 4.09 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 1 0 1 1 3 5 4.20 137/ 215 4.37 4.68 4.35 4.43 4.20 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 5 0 4 4.18 110/ 198 4.38 4.60 4.18 4.25 4.18 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 82 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 4.52 4.12 \*\*\*\* 78 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.25 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.39 \*\*\*\* 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 82 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.16 3.90 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 4 0 2 3.43 42/ 52 3.43 3.89 4.04 3.61 3.43 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 1 3.50 41/ 53 3.50 3.93 4.05 3.51 3.50 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 1 0 1 1 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.75 4.79 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 \*\*\*\*/ 37 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.58 5.00 \*\*\*\*

### Frequency Distribution

10 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.56 4.60 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned Cum		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades Reasons			Туре	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 ? 1