

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1500  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	4	4	5	3.37	1555/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	8	3.95	1221/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1016/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	1018/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	6	6	3.67	1121/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	9	4.00	870/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	912/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	912/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	633/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	713/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	557/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	669/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	363/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	709/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	881/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	696/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	396/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	144/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.26	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	110/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	54/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.84	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	51/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	78/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1500  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
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	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1501  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	3	8	4.00	1196/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	705/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	238/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	363/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	3	3	6	3.35	1320/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	715/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	795/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	719/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	231/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	340/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	208/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	730/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	200/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1027/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	873/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	642/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	360/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	51/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	23/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	28/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	20/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.92	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	1						
					4	Other					

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1502  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	3	3.82	1372/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	5	9	4.12	1068/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	908/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1061/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1205/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1370/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	497/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	860/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	354/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	896/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	299/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	867/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	371/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	4	1	3.22	1295/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1325/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	1	5	1	3.33	1351/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	676/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	219/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	86/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	68/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	121/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	64/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1502  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1503  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	5	4.05	1155/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	495/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	836/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	614/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	1	6	7	3.72	1075/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	870/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	643/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	1051/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	924/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	249/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	557/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	612/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	100/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1284/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1209/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	117/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.41	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	113/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.41	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	45/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	0	0	8	6	3.82	213/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	140/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.12	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	38/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	32/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	4.20	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1503  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1504  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	524/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1203/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: SCI 100 0201  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1505  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	2	3	8	3.53	1504/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1146/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	986/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	6	2	7	3.56	1431/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	1	4	2	3	2.93	1480/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	4	4	3	2.84	1480/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	2.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1097/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	2	8	3	3.73	1252/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	1136/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	0	17	4.68	1047/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	8	9	4.26	924/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	923/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	1	2	3	9	3.94	744/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	810/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	999/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	816/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	127/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	72/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	110/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	82/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1506  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1378/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	776/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	431/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	771/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1164/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1101/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	628/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	906/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	496/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	640/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	567/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	847/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	265/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	743/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	629/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	380/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	337/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	47/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	86/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	108/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	51/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	29/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1507  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	8	2	3.56	1495/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1111/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	915/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1094/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	5	3	3	3.20	1385/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	1251/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	768/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	832/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1324/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	496/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	917/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	525/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	1	11	4.38	399/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	901/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1114/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	917/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	360/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	85/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	64/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	60/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	72/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	32/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.82	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1508  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1004/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	495/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	878/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	905/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	1	3.25	1364/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1190/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	220/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	794/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	693/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	272/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	6	4.07	1111/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	447/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	760/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	629/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	779/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	420/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	138/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	86/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	94/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	81/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.70	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	72/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1508  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1509  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	445/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	207/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	298/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	252/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	702/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	260/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	471/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	381/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	810/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	960/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	95/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	59/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	56/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	42/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	1

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1510  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1489/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	803/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	750/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1048/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	1	2	3	3.20	1385/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1295/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	524/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1015/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	3	4.00	955/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	658/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	303/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1453/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1197/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1351/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	732/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	106/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	124/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	86/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	205/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	82/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.45	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 1

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

Course-Section: SCI 100 0305  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1511  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	735/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	314/1674	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	310/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	455/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	652/1585	3.60	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	161/1535	3.90	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	757/1656	4.11	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	171/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	867/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	505/1380	4.52	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	3.84	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.13	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	59/ 265	4.48	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	76/ 278	4.60	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	52/ 260	4.81	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	75/ 259	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/ 233	4.66	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	4.20	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	4.20	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Frequency Distribution					Reasons	Type	Majors		
		Expected Grades									
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1512  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	703/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	325/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	298/1423	4.72	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	432/1609	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	8	5	3.82	986/1585	3.82	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	619/1535	4.29	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	458/1651	4.56	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	424/1673	4.94	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	353/1582	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	234/1380	4.61	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	313/1515	4.81	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	101/ 265	4.47	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	62/ 278	4.65	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 260	4.94	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	37/ 259	4.88	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	31/ 233	4.82	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1513  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1066/1674	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	956/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	445/1423	4.43	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	786/1609	4.53	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.46	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1074/1535	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	484/1651	4.52	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	900/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1586	4.96	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1585	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	299/1582	4.76	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	453/1575	4.72	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	447/1380	4.53	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	924/1520	4.32	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	857/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	642/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	438/ 994	4.18	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.13	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	113/ 278	4.71	4.21	4.19	3.97	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	77/ 260	4.21	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	203/ 259	4.29	4.21	4.33	4.19	3.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	41/ 233	4.71	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 0

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

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: ~~READEL, KARIN~~ Sheckells, Daniel  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1514  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	954/1674	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	845/1423	4.43	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.53	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1364/1585	3.46	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	667/1535	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.52	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	4.96	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.76	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.72	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.53	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.32	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	360/ 994	4.18	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	146/ 265	4.13	4.06	4.23	3.97	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 278	4.71	4.21	4.19	3.97	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	241/ 260	4.21	4.43	4.46	4.41	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	89/ 259	4.29	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 233	4.71	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.33	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.18	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.15	4.31	3.99	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.10	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	3.69	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 0		
				? 0			