

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1032/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	774/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	844/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	860/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	2	5	3.36	1252/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	4	7	3.89	954/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	791/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	9	2	3.87	1013/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	531/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	846/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	653/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	615/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	5	2	8	3.94	730/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	558/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	822/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	660/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	187/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	53/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	64/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	84/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	43/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	50/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 101
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1342
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 102
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1343
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1384/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	5	3.83	1208/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	6	4	3.61	1131/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1151/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1289/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	5	4	3	3.06	1317/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	854/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	7	8	1	3.44	1273/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	497/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	716/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	725/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1206/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	930/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	4	0	8	4.15	845/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	873/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	536/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	140/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	49/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	38/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	69/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	37/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 103
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1344
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	6	2	3	4	3	2.78	1487/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	6	6	3.67	1306/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	6	3	3.33	1204/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	0	5	4	4	3.38	1353/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	1	2	2	1	2.25	1398/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	0	4	4	4	3.00	1322/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	4	5	4	3.28	1371/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1386/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	3	13	4.44	878/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	1014/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	3	5	8	3.94	1107/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	0	0	5	7	3.39	1297/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	974/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1128/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1001/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	932/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	630/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	170/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	3.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	101/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	105/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	132/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	0	3	8	4.07	100/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.07

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7			Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	13	Under-grad 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0			Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 1			

Course-Section: SCI 100 104
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1345
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1194/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	972/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	8	1	3.64	1123/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	979/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1138/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	2	2	0	6	3.50	1303/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	466/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	6	3	4	3.53	1230/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	904/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1037/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	920/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	926/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	752/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1001/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	904/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	932/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	839/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	64/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	59/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	105/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	123/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	85/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.21

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General	10	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100 105
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1346
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	1174/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	4	4.00	1086/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	8	4	3.72	1101/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	979/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	897/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	4	7	2	3.38	1247/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	738/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	622/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	957/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	800/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1037/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	911/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	630/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	936/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1159/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1025/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	765/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	75/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	66/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	133/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	75/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.62
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	49/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 6	General	9	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 1			

Course-Section: SCI 100 201
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1347
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1114/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	4	11	4.21	901/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	500/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	586/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	6	5	3.61	1134/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	985/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	2	9	3.95	1058/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	602/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	853/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	712/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	1269/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	779/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	1001/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	607/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	746/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	992/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	856/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	279/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	103/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.12
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	75/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	84/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	79/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.59
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	50/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 201
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1347
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 202
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1348
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	4	5	3.58	1378/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	1013/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	4	7	3.74	1098/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	3	7	3.63	1254/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	9	2	4	3.28	1276/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1107/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	696/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1168/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	904/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1107/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	4	8	4.00	1051/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	4.00	1047/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	616/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1017/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	1	4	3.50	1127/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	1	4	3.58	1129/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	3	3	1	4	3.55	691/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	82/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.26
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	85/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.32
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	57/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.74
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	75/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	40/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 202
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1348
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 203
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1349
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	6	4	4	3.47	1406/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	817/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	626/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	945/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	1	7	3.40	1237/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	970/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	555/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	408/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	7	4	2	3.43	1284/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	559/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	1115/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	469/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	6	8	4.19	947/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	3	0	4	9	4.19	545/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	896/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1023/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	570/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	80/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	44/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	27/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	26/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	23/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 203
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1349
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1375/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	1252/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	3	7	3.76	1088/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1159/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	7	2	3	3.27	1279/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1247/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	1227/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	762/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1262/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	1	12	4.29	1039/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	1234/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1157/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	1106/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	741/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	936/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	862/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	878/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	731/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	106/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	160/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	3.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	136/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	132/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	103/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 204
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1350
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 301
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1351
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	4	4	3	3.12	1469/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	3	8	3.88	1176/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	2	7	3.59	1140/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1055/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	1	4	1	3	3.00	1333/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	3	2	4	3.07	1316/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	1	12	4.18	844/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	762/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	5	0	3.15	1367/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	981/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1146/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	1025/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	1245/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	520/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	1	6	2	3.23	1125/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	974/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	907/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	0	5	3	1	3.09	792/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	102/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	32/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	19/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	29/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.87
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	31/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 302
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1352
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	3	4	7	3.61	1364/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	1	10	3.89	1176/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	3	1	11	4.12	875/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	1103/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	1074/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	1163/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	2	10	4.06	951/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	1181/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	1	11	4.06	1188/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	1146/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	1	11	4.12	992/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	1	1	10	3.82	1168/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	1	4	9	4.13	598/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	3	4	6	3.63	1001/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	1	11	4.06	889/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	3	4	8	3.94	980/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	3	2	8	3.93	507/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	84/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	4	1	11	4.11	115/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	2	1	3	1	11	4.00	161/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	0	5	2	9	3.89	148/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	3.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	3	1	2	2	10	3.83	124/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 302
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1352
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 303
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1353
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1294/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	901/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	614/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	945/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	6	2	5	3.22	1292/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	6	4	3.53	1182/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	986/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	702/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	944/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	775/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	588/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	725/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	994/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	844/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	851/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	5	1	7	4.00	932/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	650/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	53/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	73/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	57/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.74
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	71/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	56/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 303
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1353
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 304
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1354
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	1384/1509	3.62	3.69	4.31	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1246/1509	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.25	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1084/1287	3.91	3.97	4.30	4.24	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	902/1459	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	5	2	3.50	1178/1406	3.29	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1036/1384	3.51	3.61	4.11	3.98	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	854/1489	4.02	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.92	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	7	6	1	3.24	1344/1463	3.57	3.66	4.09	4.02	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	878/1438	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	716/1421	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	810/1411	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	10	4.00	1047/1405	3.99	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	784/1236	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.87	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	621/1260	3.76	3.83	4.14	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	983/1255	3.93	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	818/1258	4.06	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	196/ 873	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.89	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	0	3	4	9	4.00	106/ 184	4.15	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	53/ 198	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	48/ 184	4.60	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	3	1	3	10	4.18	128/ 177	4.48	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	69/ 165	4.42	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.39

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	

00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			Major 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 5	General	15	Under-grad 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 102
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1355
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1079/1509	4.15	3.69	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	720/1509	4.37	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	590/1287	4.37	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	454/1459	4.40	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	656/1406	3.81	3.36	4.09	4.02	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	531/1384	4.23	3.61	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	674/1489	4.31	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.92	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	325/1463	4.25	3.66	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	846/1421	4.80	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	416/1411	4.61	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	321/1405	4.73	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	322/1236	4.38	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	528/1260	4.24	3.83	4.14	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	740/1255	4.41	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	577/1258	4.68	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	274/ 873	4.47	3.84	4.03	3.89	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	37/ 184	4.40	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	78/ 198	4.44	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.39
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	48/ 184	4.70	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	82/ 177	4.56	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	34/ 165	4.49	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.72
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 102
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1355
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	14	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 202
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1356
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	6	4.24	901/1509	4.15	3.69	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	753/1509	4.37	4.06	4.26	4.25	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	747/1287	4.37	3.97	4.30	4.24	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	726/1459	4.40	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1231/1406	3.81	3.36	4.09	4.02	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	734/1384	4.23	3.61	4.11	3.98	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	717/1489	4.31	4.06	4.17	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	622/1506	4.94	4.92	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	853/1463	4.25	3.66	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	334/1438	4.83	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	768/1421	4.80	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	544/1411	4.61	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	432/1405	4.73	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	441/1236	4.38	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	712/1260	4.24	3.83	4.14	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	575/1255	4.41	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.68	4.15	4.38	4.18	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	193/ 873	4.47	3.84	4.03	3.89	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	102/ 184	4.40	4.18	4.16	4.06	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	59/ 198	4.44	4.41	4.22	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	90/ 184	4.70	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	81/ 177	4.56	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	81/ 165	4.49	4.43	4.18	4.15	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 202
 Title Water; Interdis Study
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1356
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						