

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 101
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	1	7	6	1	2.95	1495/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	3	4	3.53	1401/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	1	3.05	1304/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	4	5	4	3.41	1392/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	2	6	3	1	2.93	1390/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	1	6	4	2	3.06	1340/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1278/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	1257/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	854/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1260/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	916/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	944/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	654/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1124/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	879/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1028/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	839/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 101
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	170/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	153/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	2	0	1	8	4.08	165/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.08
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	152/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	126/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 101
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	13	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	1	7	6	1	2.95	1495/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	3	4	3.53	1401/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	1	3.05	1304/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	4	5	4	3.41	1392/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	2	6	3	1	2.93	1390/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	1	6	4	2	3.06	1340/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1278/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1124/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	879/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1028/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	839/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	170/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	153/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	2	0	1	8	4.08	165/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.08
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	152/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	126/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	13	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 101	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

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

84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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					
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 102
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	3	4	3.50	1408/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	818/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	1003/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1169/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1329/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	1108/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	895/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	8	0	3.67	1203/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	818/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1043/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	683/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1021/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	405/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1100/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	879/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	898/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	573/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 102
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	58/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	68/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	67/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	106/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	15	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	3	4	3.50	1408/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	818/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	1003/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1169/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1329/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	1108/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	895/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1100/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	879/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	898/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	573/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	58/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	68/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	67/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	106/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	15	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 103
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	4	6	3.63	1363/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1113/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	8	3.84	1121/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1047/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1297/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1130/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	318/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	10	1	3.61	1233/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	830/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1019/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	812/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1076/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	511/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	950/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1140/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	903/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	699/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 103
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	117/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	95/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	24/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	102/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	102/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.23
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	15	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 103	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Schreier,Susan		

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

	P	0					to be significant
	I	0	Other			2	
	?	1					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	4	6	3.63	1363/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1113/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	8	3.84	1121/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1047/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1297/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1130/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	318/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	950/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1140/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	903/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	699/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	117/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	95/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	24/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	102/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	102/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.23
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	15	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 103	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

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

	P	0		to be significant
	I	0	Other	2
	?	1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 104
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	2	4	5	3	2.95	1495/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	2	9	3.68	1345/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	2	4	5	3.29	1284/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	3	3	5	3.00	1453/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1394/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	3	4	4	3.00	1345/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	4	1	11	4.06	1011/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	7	2	1	3.08	1398/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	981/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1019/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	742/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1193/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	0	0	9	6	3.83	882/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1168/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1040/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1188/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	596/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 104
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	182/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	3.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	172/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	151/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	106/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	136/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 104
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	4	5	3	2.95	1495/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	2	9	3.68	1345/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	2	4	5	3.29	1284/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	3	3	5	3.00	1453/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1394/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	3	4	4	3.00	1345/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	4	1	11	4.06	1011/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1168/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1040/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1188/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	596/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	182/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	3.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	172/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	151/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	106/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	136/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 104	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 105
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	674/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	922/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	889/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	867/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	2	6	3.47	1237/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	501/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	654/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	811/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	253/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	310/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	283/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	502/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	136/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	701/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	926/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 105
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	19/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	29/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	15/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	12/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.93
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 105	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Schreier, Susan		

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

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	674/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	922/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	889/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	867/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	2	6	3.47	1237/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	501/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	654/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	701/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	926/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	19/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	29/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	15/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	12/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****	

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0				

**** - Means there are not enough responses

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 105	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

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

	P	0		to be significant
	I	0	Other	0
	?	3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	4	5	4	3.22	1462/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1326/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	4	5	3.44	1258/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1233/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1305/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	2	7	3.53	1202/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	6	9	4.17	895/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	1178/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1239/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	920/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	886/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	792/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	2	11	4.00	1076/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	958/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1100/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1102/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	909/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	617/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	105/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	79/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	94/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	104/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	38/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 203
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	434/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	575/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	648/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	496/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	753/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	501/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	182/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1044/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	911/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	133/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	310/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	283/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	335/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	604/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	405/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	329/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	257/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	261/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 203
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	42/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	32/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	72/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	36/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.77
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	23/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.77

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 3	General	9 Under-grad 18 Non-major 3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 204
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	6	6	3	3.44	1423/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	988/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	769/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	879/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	1361/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	3	9	3.83	1032/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	1101/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1152/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	8	3	3.80	1118/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	718/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	964/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	713/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	711/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	6	1	8	3.82	888/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	319/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	750/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	719/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 204
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	138/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	107/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	104/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	93/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	87/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	1	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 301
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	4	2	2	4	2.76	1508/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1456/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	1	6	3.18	1295/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	4	1	5	3.00	1453/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1282/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	3	3	3	2.88	1372/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1353/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	3	6	2	1	2.92	1426/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	2	8	3.88	1270/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	1367/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	1252/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	7	3.65	1261/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	1	5	4	4	3.29	1129/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1096/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1202/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1240/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	787/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 301
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	168/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	3.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	189/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	167/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	177/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	157/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	3.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100 301	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Schreier, Susan		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	4	2	2	4	2.76	1508/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1456/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	1	6	3.18	1295/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	4	1	5	3.00	1453/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1282/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	3	3	3	2.88	1372/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1353/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1096/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1202/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1240/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	787/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	168/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	3.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	189/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	167/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	177/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	157/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	3.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 302
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	7	3	4	3.29	1454/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1380/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	5	1	7	3.56	1226/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	1311/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1349/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	4	4	3.53	1202/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1379/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	618/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1396/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	887/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1252/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	3	6	5	3.75	1226/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	2	6	3.56	1285/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	728/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1156/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1177/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1152/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	839/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 302
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	33/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	20/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	104/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	128/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	87/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	7	3	4	3.29	1454/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1380/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	5	1	7	3.56	1226/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	1311/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1349/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	4	4	3.53	1202/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1379/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	618/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1156/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1177/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1152/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	839/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	33/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	20/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	104/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	128/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	87/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 303
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1109/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	882/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	898/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	2	8	4.00	1047/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	851/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	703/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	654/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	601/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1110/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	604/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	774/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	669/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	578/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	282/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	620/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	696/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	724/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	467/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 303
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	44/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	90/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	67/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	42/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 303
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1109/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	882/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	898/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	2	8	4.00	1047/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	851/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	703/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	654/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	601/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	620/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	696/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	724/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	467/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	44/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	90/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	67/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	42/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 304
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	4	3	4	2.94	1495/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	6	3	3.47	1413/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1290/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	3	3	5	2	3.00	1453/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	6	3	1	2.93	1390/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	1372/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	3	5	5	3.47	1329/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	5	1	3.38	1320/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1093/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	1183/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	742/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	930/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	1	0	5	5	3.77	930/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	900/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	786/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	584/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	659/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 304
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	138/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	90/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	30/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	95/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100 304
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	4	3	4	2.94	1495/1528	3.45	3.47	4.31	4.16	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	6	3	3.47	1413/1527	3.86	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1290/1333	3.68	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	3	3	5	2	3.00	1453/1495	3.66	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	6	3	1	2.93	1390/1439	3.28	3.31	4.11	3.97	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	1372/1425	3.55	3.57	4.12	3.93	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	3	5	5	3.47	1329/1508	3.98	4.02	4.18	4.11	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.85	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1490	3.56	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1428	4.51	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1436	4.64	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1427	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1425	4.18	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1291	4.07	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	900/1271	3.73	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	786/1276	3.94	3.93	4.33	4.14	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	584/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	659/922	3.62	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	138/198	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	90/208	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.62	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	30/194	4.44	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	95/176	4.28	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/42	****	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/41	****	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/32	****	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 101
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	1109/1528	3.62	3.47	4.31	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	882/1527	3.87	3.86	4.28	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	943/1333	3.80	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	942/1495	3.83	3.68	4.25	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1264/1439	3.51	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	942/1425	3.69	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	883/1508	4.28	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	14	2	4.00	1421/1526	4.62	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	639/1490	4.05	3.63	4.11	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	253/1428	4.67	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	580/1436	4.74	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	283/1427	4.68	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	502/1425	4.42	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	440/1291	4.35	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	733/1271	3.84	3.74	4.16	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1062/1276	3.81	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	543/1273	3.80	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	617/922	3.85	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 101
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	110/198	4.13	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	51/208	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	104/194	4.61	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	116/194	4.50	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	63/176	4.46	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	23/42	4.40	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.40
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	17/41	4.40	4.40	4.06	4.10	4.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	26/32	3.80	3.80	4.20	4.09	3.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 101
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 1	General	15 Under-grad 18 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			4 ? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1433/1528	3.62	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1352/1527	3.87	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	1204/1333	3.80	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1301/1495	3.83	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1184/1439	3.51	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	1180/1425	3.69	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	681/1508	4.28	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.62	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1110/1490	4.05	3.63	4.11	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	898/1428	4.67	4.53	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1114/1436	4.74	4.65	4.74	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	506/1427	4.68	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	966/1425	4.42	4.21	4.34	4.31	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	504/1291	4.35	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	992/1271	3.84	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1021/1276	3.81	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1191/1273	3.80	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	551/922	3.85	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier, Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	125/198	4.13	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	123/208	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	122/194	4.61	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	82/194	4.50	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	65/176	4.46	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/42	4.40	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/41	4.40	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	3.80	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Schreier,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 4	General	8 Under-grad 16 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F 1	Electives	0
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			2 ? 2		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1433/1528	3.62	3.47	4.31	4.16	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1352/1527	3.87	3.86	4.28	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	1204/1333	3.80	3.69	4.34	4.26	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1301/1495	3.83	3.68	4.25	4.11	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1184/1439	3.51	3.31	4.11	3.97	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	1180/1425	3.69	3.57	4.12	3.93	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	681/1508	4.28	4.02	4.18	4.11	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.62	4.85	4.66	4.57	4.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	992/1271	3.84	3.74	4.16	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1021/1276	3.81	3.93	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1191/1273	3.80	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	551/922	3.85	3.65	4.02	3.87	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	125/198	4.13	4.13	4.16	3.90	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	123/208	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	122/194	4.61	4.62	4.56	4.54	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	82/194	4.50	4.45	4.37	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	65/176	4.46	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SCI 100Y 201
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/42	4.40	4.40	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/41	4.40	4.40	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	3.80	3.80	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 201	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Water; Interdis Study		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

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

Self Paced														
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives		0		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									