

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	22

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	2	4	9	6	3.77	1331/1542	3.92	3.92	4.33	4.18	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1082/1542	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.23	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	11	8	4.14	919/1339	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.14	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	1058/1498	4.17	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	8	4	3	3.47	1240/1428	3.80	3.80	4.12	3.98	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	923/1407	4.06	4.06	4.15	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	746/1521	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.09	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	884/1541	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	13	1	3.83	1107/1518	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.00	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	367/1472	4.80	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	808/1475	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	413/1471	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.23	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	960/1470	4.45	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	526/1310	4.24	4.24	4.06	3.93	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1210	4.45	4.45	4.18	3.91	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	580/1211	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	630/1207	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.12	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/859	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	22

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	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/207	4.33	4.33	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/210	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/202	4.71	4.71	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/202	4.70	4.70	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/199	4.80	4.80	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	22

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	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	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 100 100
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	22

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	2	4	9	6	3.77	1331/1542	3.92	3.92	4.33	4.18	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1082/1542	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.23	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	11	8	4.14	919/1339	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.14	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	1058/1498	4.17	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	8	4	3	3.47	1240/1428	3.80	3.80	4.12	3.98	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	923/1407	4.06	4.06	4.15	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	746/1521	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.09	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	884/1541	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1518	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.00	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1472	4.80	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1475	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1471	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.23	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1470	4.45	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1310	4.24	4.24	4.06	3.93	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1210	4.45	4.45	4.18	3.91	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	580/1211	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	630/1207	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.12	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/859	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	22

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	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/207	4.33	4.33	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/210	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/202	4.71	4.71	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/202	4.70	4.70	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/199	4.80	4.80	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	22

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	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 17	Under-grad 22 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	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 100 200
Title:	Water; Interdis Study
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	58

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	5	2	14	17	19	3.75	1343/1542	3.92	3.92	4.33	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	22	28	4.31	855/1542	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.23	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	10	16	31	4.31	775/1339	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.14	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	13	16	21	4.10	1012/1498	4.17	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	3	10	12	14	3.80	1061/1428	3.80	3.80	4.12	3.98	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	0	10	21	16	3.88	989/1407	4.06	4.06	4.15	3.92	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	18	30	4.35	721/1521	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.09	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	47	4.85	771/1541	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	2	11	16	17	4.04	888/1518	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.00	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	47	4.78	418/1472	4.80	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	7	48	4.76	897/1475	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	14	38	4.56	577/1471	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.23	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	13	36	4.38	844/1470	4.45	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	5	2	4	16	25	4.04	744/1310	4.24	4.24	4.06	3.93	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	621/1210	4.45	4.45	4.18	3.91	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	580/1211	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	546/1207	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.12	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	41	3	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	****/859	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	58

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	13	1	3	2	6	18	15	3.91	140/207	4.33	4.33	4.12	3.92	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	4	0	5	15	22	4.11	131/210	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	1	0	1	8	34	4.68	76/202	4.71	4.71	4.50	4.49	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	1	1	11	32	4.64	74/202	4.70	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	1	0	3	8	32	4.59	52/199	4.80	4.80	4.15	4.14	4.59
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	58

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	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	34	Under-grad	58	Non-major	28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	15						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
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	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	1060/1542	3.92	3.92	4.33	4.18	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	855/1542	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.23	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	730/1339	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.14	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	733/1498	4.17	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	758/1428	3.80	3.80	4.12	3.98	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	673/1407	4.06	4.06	4.15	3.92	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	772/1521	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.09	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1020/1541	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	732/1518	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.00	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	319/1472	4.80	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	861/1475	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	319/1471	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.23	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	438/1470	4.45	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	1	12	4.39	445/1310	4.24	4.24	4.06	3.93	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	704/1210	4.45	4.45	4.18	3.91	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	809/1211	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	790/1207	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.12	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
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	9	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	51/207	4.33	4.33	4.12	3.92	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	87/210	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	66/202	4.71	4.71	4.50	4.49	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/202	4.70	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	11/199	4.80	4.80	4.15	4.14	4.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
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	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 12	Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other 0	

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
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	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	1060/1542	3.92	3.92	4.33	4.18	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	855/1542	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.23	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	730/1339	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.14	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	733/1498	4.17	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	758/1428	3.80	3.80	4.12	3.98	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	673/1407	4.06	4.06	4.15	3.92	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	772/1521	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.09	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1020/1541	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1518	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.00	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1472	4.80	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1475	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1471	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.23	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1470	4.45	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1310	4.24	4.24	4.06	3.93	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	704/1210	4.45	4.45	4.18	3.91	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	809/1211	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	790/1207	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.12	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
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	9	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	51/207	4.33	4.33	4.12	3.92	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	87/210	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	66/202	4.71	4.71	4.50	4.49	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/202	4.70	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	11/199	4.80	4.80	4.15	4.14	4.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	100
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	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 12	Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		