

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	9	7	10	3.56	1479/1589	3.69	3.69	4.32	4.20	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	7	8	14	4.17	1034/1589	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	7	5	17	4.16	954/1391	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.29	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	8	5	16	4.17	943/1552	4.14	4.14	4.25	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	8	5	11	4.13	824/1495	3.74	3.74	4.14	4.07	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	5	9	13	4.10	823/1457	3.91	3.91	4.15	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	6	20	4.35	710/1572	4.36	4.36	4.21	4.18	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	327/1589	4.88	4.88	4.66	4.59	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	7	15	1	3.67	1277/1569	3.84	3.84	4.13	4.08	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	26	4.72	559/1530	4.70	4.70	4.49	4.45	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	586/1533	4.86	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	21	4.44	780/1528	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	1	22	4.25	1003/1529	4.38	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	251/1393	4.39	4.39	4.06	3.99	4.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	3	5	5	3.37	1194/1337	3.63	3.63	4.17	4.01	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	3	6	2	9	3.85	1101/1331	3.82	3.82	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	846/1333	4.36	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	****/1014	3.53	3.53	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	92/180	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	2	0	1	3	12	4.28	89/194	4.42	4.42	4.17	4.36	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	67/178	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.57	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	142/181	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.54	4.06
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	16/165	4.51	4.51	4.12	4.37	4.78
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 19	Under-grad 33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	9	7	10	3.56	1479/1589	3.69	3.69	4.32	4.20	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	7	8	14	4.17	1034/1589	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	7	5	17	4.16	954/1391	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.29	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	8	5	16	4.17	943/1552	4.14	4.14	4.25	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	8	5	11	4.13	824/1495	3.74	3.74	4.14	4.07	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	5	9	13	4.10	823/1457	3.91	3.91	4.15	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	6	20	4.35	710/1572	4.36	4.36	4.21	4.18	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	327/1589	4.88	4.88	4.66	4.59	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1569	3.84	3.84	4.13	4.08	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	3	5	5	3.37	1194/1337	3.63	3.63	4.17	4.01	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	3	6	2	9	3.85	1101/1331	3.82	3.82	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	846/1333	4.36	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	****/1014	3.53	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	92/180	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	2	0	1	3	12	4.28	89/194	4.42	4.42	4.17	4.36	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	67/178	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.57	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	142/181	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.54	4.06
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	16/165	4.51	4.51	4.12	4.37	4.78

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 19	Under-grad 33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>61</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	6	13	19	18	3.68	1432/1589	3.69	3.69	4.32	4.20	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	23	29	4.30	891/1589	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.28	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	9	23	26	4.22	911/1391	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.29	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	7	5	21	22	4.00	1081/1552	4.14	4.14	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	5	6	5	13	19	3.73	1175/1495	3.74	3.74	4.14	4.07	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	6	9	18	22	3.81	1078/1457	3.91	3.91	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	16	34	4.40	659/1572	4.36	4.36	4.21	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	17	40	4.70	920/1589	4.88	4.88	4.66	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	7	31	11	4.00	957/1569	3.84	3.84	4.13	4.08	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	49	4.81	381/1530	4.70	4.70	4.49	4.45	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	54	4.93	410/1533	4.86	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	15	42	4.74	377/1528	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	12	42	4.54	689/1529	4.38	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	3	5	19	28	4.19	640/1393	4.39	4.39	4.06	3.99	4.19
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	4	2	5	14	11	3.72	1039/1337	3.63	3.63	4.17	4.01	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	3	5	13	15	4.11	948/1331	3.82	3.82	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	2	13	19	4.33	832/1333	4.36	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	25	10	2	0	5	8	11	4.00	554/1014	3.53	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: <b>SCI 100 200</b>		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: <b>101</b>				
Title: <b>Water; Interdis Study</b>										Questionnaires: <b>61</b>				
Instructor: <b>Braunschweig,Su</b>														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	1	3	4	20	19	4.13	106/180	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	2	2	15	27	4.46	68/194	4.42	4.42	4.17	4.36	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	15	31	4.67	76/178	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	4	14	27	4.46	100/181	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.54	4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	3	7	9	26	4.22	87/165	4.51	4.51	4.12	4.37	4.22
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>61</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	45	Under-grad	61	Non-major	26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	12	7	11	3.81	1351/1589	3.69	3.69	4.32	4.20	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	12	15	4.22	985/1589	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.28	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	19	4.31	818/1391	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.29	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	4	2	8	15	4.17	932/1552	4.14	4.14	4.25	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	4	6	9	4	3.36	1371/1495	3.74	3.74	4.14	4.07	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	6	9	10	3.77	1121/1457	3.91	3.91	4.15	3.99	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	11	17	4.34	723/1572	4.36	4.36	4.21	4.18	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	467/1589	4.88	4.88	4.66	4.59	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	19	2	3.85	1134/1569	3.84	3.84	4.13	4.08	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	7	22	4.58	773/1530	4.70	4.70	4.49	4.45	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	977/1533	4.86	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	682/1528	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	9	16	4.34	914/1529	4.38	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	2	1	6	18	4.36	489/1393	4.39	4.39	4.06	3.99	4.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	958/1337	3.63	3.63	4.17	4.01	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	2	1	3	6	3.64	1184/1331	3.82	3.82	4.35	4.18	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	765/1333	4.36	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	898/1014	3.53	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.30

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	102/180	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	55/194	4.42	4.42	4.17	4.36	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	118/178	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	85/181	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.54	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	57/165	4.51	4.51	4.12	4.37	4.38
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	21	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	12	7	11	3.81	1351/1589	3.69	3.69	4.32	4.20	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	12	15	4.22	985/1589	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.28	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	19	4.31	818/1391	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.29	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	4	2	8	15	4.17	932/1552	4.14	4.14	4.25	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	4	6	9	4	3.36	1371/1495	3.74	3.74	4.14	4.07	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	6	9	10	3.77	1121/1457	3.91	3.91	4.15	3.99	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	11	17	4.34	723/1572	4.36	4.36	4.21	4.18	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	467/1589	4.88	4.88	4.66	4.59	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1569	3.84	3.84	4.13	4.08	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1530	4.70	4.70	4.49	4.45	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1533	4.86	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1528	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1529	4.38	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1393	4.39	4.39	4.06	3.99	4.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	958/1337	3.63	3.63	4.17	4.01	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	2	1	3	6	3.64	1184/1331	3.82	3.82	4.35	4.18	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	765/1333	4.36	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	898/1014	3.53	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.30

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	102/180	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	55/194	4.42	4.42	4.17	4.36	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	118/178	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	85/181	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.54	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	57/165	4.51	4.51	4.12	4.37	4.38
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	21	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						