

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                                                           |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----                                                     |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 2 | 1 | 9 | 6  | 4.06       | 1189/1670 | 3.99        | 3.95      | 4.31      | 4.23       | 4.06      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.39       | 808/1666  | 4.21        | 4.24      | 4.27      | 4.30       | 4.39      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 5 | 6 | 6  | 4.06       | 1027/1406 | 4.10        | 4.19      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 4.06      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9  | 4.39       | 712/1615  | 4.21        | 4.22      | 4.24      | 4.17       | 4.39      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1  | 5  | 1           | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1  | 3.62       | 1225/1566 | 3.59        | 3.55      | 4.07      | 4.03       | 3.62      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9  | 4.22       | 733/1528  | 4.00        | 4.01      | 4.12      | 4.00       | 4.22      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 4.44       | 660/1650  | 4.30        | 4.34      | 4.22      | 4.28       | 4.44      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00       | 1/1667    | 4.84        | 4.86      | 4.67      | 4.61       | 5.00      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2  | 3.77       | 1247/1626 | 3.86        | 3.94      | 4.11      | 4.07       | 3.77      |
| Lecture                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72       | 572/1559  | 4.66        | 4.69      | 4.46      | 4.47       | 4.72      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 4.82       | 803/1560  | 4.74        | 4.76      | 4.72      | 4.68       | 4.82      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71       | 439/1549  | 4.55        | 4.59      | 4.31      | 4.32       | 4.71      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2  | 1  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.38       | 879/1546  | 4.47        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.32       | 4.38      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2  | 0  | 0           | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.29       | 514/1323  | 4.35        | 4.39      | 4.00      | 3.91       | 4.29      |
| Discussion                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 10 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1  | 3.56       | 1080/1384 | 3.93        | 3.96      | 4.10      | 3.92       | 3.56      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 11 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2  | 3.75       | 1110/1378 | 4.16        | 4.21      | 4.29      | 4.09       | 3.75      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3  | 4.25       | 867/1378  | 4.32        | 4.40      | 4.31      | 4.08       | 4.25      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 11 | 5  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0  | 3.33       | ****/ 904 | 4.07        | 4.02      | 4.03      | 3.94       | ****      |
| Laboratory                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9  | 4.39       | 94/ 232   | 4.56        | 4.60      | 4.19      | 4.25       | 4.39      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56       | 77/ 239   | 4.68        | 4.70      | 4.21      | 4.35       | 4.56      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.78       | 69/ 230   | 4.86        | 4.88      | 4.44      | 4.58       | 4.78      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72       | 75/ 231   | 4.89        | 4.85      | 4.31      | 4.45       | 4.72      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4.44       | 90/ 218   | 4.80        | 4.82      | 4.18      | 4.47       | 4.44      |
| Seminar                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2  | 4.33       | ****/ 87  | ****        | ****      | 4.65      | 4.67       | ****      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1  | 3.67       | ****/ 79  | 4.60        | 4.60      | 4.64      | 4.72       | ****      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 16 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 75  | ****        | ****      | 4.57      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 16 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 4.45      | 4.59       | ****      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 4.00       | ****/ 80  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 3.97      | 3.99       | ****      |
| Field Work                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0  | 3.33       | ****/ 41  | 4.46        | 4.46      | 4.50      | 3.91       | ****      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 4.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.36        | 4.36      | 4.19      | 4.07       | ****      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 16 | 1  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50       | ****/ 38  | 4.71        | 4.71      | 4.62      | 4.63       | ****      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0  | 3.67       | ****/ 39  | 4.33        | 4.33      | 4.27      | 4.42       | ****      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 16 | 1  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50       | ****/ 31  | 3.80        | 3.80      | 4.47      | 4.28       | ****      |
| Self Paced                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 28  | 3.60        | 3.60      | 4.64      | 4.59       | ****      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 16  | ****        | ****      | 4.67      | 4.83       | ****      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 27  | 4.40        | 4.40      | 4.54      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 10  | ****        | ****      | 4.84      | 4.75       | ****      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 6   | ****        | ****      | 4.92      | 4.83       | ****      |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1476  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |    | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 3  | Required for Majors | 14   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 11 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 1  | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 19 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150         | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D               | 0  |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F               | 1  | Electives           | 1    | #### - 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: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1477  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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 |      |      |
| -----                                                     |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10         | 5  | 4.11   | 1150/1670 | 3.99 | 3.95  | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.11 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6          | 10 | 4.44   | 719/1666  | 4.21 | 4.24  | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5          | 10 | 4.28   | 860/1406  | 4.10 | 4.19  | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.28 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6          | 9  | 4.35   | 750/1615  | 4.21 | 4.22  | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.35 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 5  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4          | 3  | 3.46   | 1310/1566 | 3.59 | 3.55  | 4.07 | 4.03 | 3.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5          | 8  | 4.06   | 870/1528  | 4.00 | 4.01  | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4          | 13 | 4.67   | 361/1650  | 4.30 | 4.34  | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 18 | 5.00   | 1/1667    | 4.84 | 4.86  | 4.67 | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10         | 3  | 4.00   | 953/1626  | 3.86 | 3.94  | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.00 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4          | 13 | 4.61   | 755/1559  | 4.66 | 4.69  | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3          | 15 | 4.83   | 777/1560  | 4.74 | 4.76  | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5          | 13 | 4.72   | 410/1549  | 4.55 | 4.59  | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.72 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5          | 11 | 4.59   | 619/1546  | 4.47 | 4.51  | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.59 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4          | 12 | 4.65   | 248/1323  | 4.35 | 4.39  | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.65 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5          | 3  | 4.00   | 820/1384  | 3.93 | 3.96  | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4          | 6  | 4.45   | 660/1378  | 4.16 | 4.21  | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.45 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3          | 6  | 4.36   | 786/1378  | 4.32 | 4.40  | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.36 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 5  | 4.57   | 214/ 904  | 4.07 | 4.02  | 4.03 | 3.94 | 4.57 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 6  | 4.63   | 62/ 232   | 4.56 | 4.60  | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.63 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 6  | 4.75   | 48/ 239   | 4.68 | 4.70  | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.75 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 6  | 4.75   | 74/ 230   | 4.86 | 4.88  | 4.44 | 4.58 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 8  | 5.00   | 1/ 231    | 4.89 | 4.85  | 4.31 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 7  | 4.75   | 39/ 218   | 4.80 | 4.82  | 4.18 | 4.47 | 4.75 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 87  | **** | ****  | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 79  | 4.60 | 4.60  | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 75  | **** | ****  | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 79  | 4.20 | 4.20  | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 80  | 4.20 | 4.20  | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 41  | 4.46 | 4.46  | 4.50 | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 38  | 4.36 | 4.36  | 4.19 | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 38  | 4.71 | 4.71  | 4.62 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 39  | 4.33 | 4.33  | 4.27 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 31  | 3.80 | 3.80  | 4.47 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 28  | 3.60 | 3.60  | 4.64 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 16  | **** | ****  | 4.67 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 27  | 4.40 | 4.40  | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 10  | **** | ****  | 4.84 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 17          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 6   | **** | ****  | 4.92 | 4.83 | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1477  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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 | 14   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 9 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 0 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 2    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1478  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | Frequencies |    |   |   |   | Instructor |    | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------|------|
|                                                           | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4          | 5  |             |           |           |            |           | Mean | Rank |
| -----                                                     |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10         | 4  | 3.76        | 1436/1670 | 3.99      | 3.95       | 4.31      | 4.23 | 3.76 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7          | 12 | 4.48        | 670/1666  | 4.21      | 4.24       | 4.27      | 4.30 | 4.48 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12         | 8  | 4.29        | 852/1406  | 4.10      | 4.19       | 4.32      | 4.31 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9          | 9  | 4.19        | 944/1615  | 4.21      | 4.22       | 4.24      | 4.17 | 4.19 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 6  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4          | 1  | 3.00        | 1478/1566 | 3.59      | 3.55       | 4.07      | 4.03 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8          | 8  | 4.10        | 842/1528  | 4.00      | 4.01       | 4.12      | 4.00 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5          | 11 | 4.30        | 844/1650  | 4.30      | 4.34       | 4.22      | 4.28 | 4.30 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 2           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 15 | 4.94        | 472/1667  | 4.84      | 4.86       | 4.67      | 4.61 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10         | 3  | 4.00        | 953/1626  | 3.86      | 3.94       | 4.11      | 4.07 | 4.00 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4          | 17 | 4.81        | 435/1559  | 4.66      | 4.69       | 4.46      | 4.47 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4          | 17 | 4.81        | 855/1560  | 4.74      | 4.76       | 4.72      | 4.68 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5          | 15 | 4.75        | 366/1549  | 4.55      | 4.59       | 4.31      | 4.32 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5          | 12 | 4.53        | 691/1546  | 4.47      | 4.51       | 4.32      | 4.32 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 16 | 4.70        | 217/1323  | 4.35      | 4.39       | 4.00      | 3.91 | 4.70 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2          | 1  | 3.11        | 1251/1384 | 3.93      | 3.96       | 4.10      | 3.92 | 3.11 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 12          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2          | 4  | 3.89        | 1064/1378 | 4.16      | 4.21       | 4.29      | 4.09 | 3.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 12          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1          | 4  | 3.89        | 1061/1378 | 4.32      | 4.40       | 4.31      | 4.08 | 3.89 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 12          | 4  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 1  | 2.80        | ****/ 904 | 4.07      | 4.02       | 4.03      | 3.94 | **** |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 5           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5          | 10 | 4.50        | 80/ 232   | 4.56      | 4.60       | 4.19      | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 12 | 4.63        | 67/ 239   | 4.68      | 4.70       | 4.21      | 4.35 | 4.63 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5          | 11 | 4.69        | 89/ 230   | 4.86      | 4.88       | 4.44      | 4.58 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 14 | 4.88        | 45/ 231   | 4.89      | 4.85       | 4.31      | 4.45 | 4.88 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 14 | 4.81        | 31/ 218   | 4.80      | 4.82       | 4.18      | 4.47 | 4.81 |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2  | 4.67        | ****/ 41  | 4.46      | 4.46       | 4.50      | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 2  | 4.33        | ****/ 38  | 4.36      | 4.36       | 4.19      | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3          | 0  | 4.00        | ****/ 38  | 4.71      | 4.71       | 4.62      | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 18          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 0  | 3.50        | ****/ 39  | 4.33      | 4.33       | 4.27      | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 18          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1          | 1  | 3.67        | ****/ 31  | 3.80      | 3.80       | 4.47      | 4.28 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors                 |                                                               |              |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A 5  | Required for Majors 19 | Graduate 0                                                    | Major 0      |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B 9  |                        |                                                               |              |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 3       | C 7  | General 0              | Under-grad 21                                                 | Non-major 21 |
| 84-150         | 7        | 3.00-3.49       | 3       | D 0  |                        |                                                               |              |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 6       | F 0  | Electives 0            | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |              |
|                |          |                 |         | P 0  |                        |                                                               |              |
|                |          |                 |         | I 0  | Other 1                |                                                               |              |
|                |          |                 |         | ? 0  |                        |                                                               |              |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1479  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR |   | Frequencies |   |   |   |    | Instructor |           | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|                                                           | 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 | 4 | 5 | 5  | 4.07       | 1178/1670 | 3.99   | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.23  | 4.07 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 2  | 0 | 2           | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6  | 3.79       | 1393/1666 | 4.21   | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.30  | 3.79 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 2  | 0 | 1           | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6  | 3.86       | 1158/1406 | 4.10   | 4.19 | 4.32 | 4.31  | 3.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 2  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7  | 4.29       | 837/1615  | 4.21   | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.17  | 4.29 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 3  | 3 | 3           | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2  | 3.00       | 1478/1566 | 3.59   | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.03  | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3  | 0 | 0           | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 4.00       | 899/1528  | 4.00   | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.00  | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 3  | 0 | 0           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8  | 4.31       | 844/1650  | 4.30   | 4.34 | 4.22 | 4.28  | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 3  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00       | 1/1667    | 4.84   | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.61  | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7  | 0 | 1           | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2  | 3.56       | 1365/1626 | 3.86   | 3.94 | 4.11 | 4.07  | 3.56 |
| Lecture                                                   |    |   |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 5  | 0 | 1           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7  | 4.27       | 1143/1559 | 4.66   | 4.69 | 4.46 | 4.47  | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 5  | 0 | 1           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7  | 4.27       | 1405/1560 | 4.74   | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.68  | 4.27 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 6  | 0 | 1           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6  | 4.20       | 1027/1549 | 4.55   | 4.59 | 4.31 | 4.32  | 4.20 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 5  | 1 | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5  | 4.30       | 949/1546  | 4.47   | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.32  | 4.30 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 5  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6  | 4.27       | 529/1323  | 4.35   | 4.39 | 4.00 | 3.91  | 4.27 |
| Discussion                                                |    |   |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 12 | 0 | 2           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0  | 2.50       | 1333/1384 | 3.93   | 3.96 | 4.10 | 3.92  | 2.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 12 | 0 | 1           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 3.25       | 1265/1378 | 4.16   | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.09  | 3.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 12 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2  | 4.25       | 867/1378  | 4.32   | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.08  | 4.25 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 12 | 2 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50       | ****/ 904 | 4.07   | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.94  | **** |
| Laboratory                                                |    |   |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 9  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6  | 4.86       | 25/ 232   | 4.56   | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.25  | 4.86 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4  | 4.57       | 74/ 239   | 4.68   | 4.70 | 4.21 | 4.35  | 4.57 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 9  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00       | 1/ 230    | 4.86   | 4.88 | 4.44 | 4.58  | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 9  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00       | 1/ 231    | 4.89   | 4.85 | 4.31 | 4.45  | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 9  | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6  | 4.86       | 29/ 218   | 4.80   | 4.82 | 4.18 | 4.47  | 4.86 |
| Seminar                                                   |    |   |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 87  | ****   | **** | 4.65 | 4.67  | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.60   | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.72  | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 75  | ****   | **** | 4.57 | 4.46  | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.20   | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.59  | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 80  | 4.20   | 4.20 | 3.97 | 3.99  | **** |
| Field Work                                                |    |   |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 14 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50       | ****/ 41  | 4.46   | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.91  | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 14 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50       | ****/ 38  | 4.36   | 4.36 | 4.19 | 4.07  | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 14 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50       | ****/ 38  | 4.71   | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.63  | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 14 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50       | ****/ 39  | 4.33   | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.42  | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 14 | 1 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 31  | 3.80   | 3.80 | 4.47 | 4.28  | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |    |   |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 28  | 3.60   | 3.60 | 4.64 | 4.59  | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 16  | ****   | **** | 4.67 | 4.83  | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 27  | 4.40   | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.46  | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 10  | ****   | **** | 4.84 | 4.75  | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 15 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 6   | ****   | **** | 4.92 | 4.83  | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1479  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 5 | Required for Majors | 8    | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 3 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C               | 1 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 16 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150         | 1 | 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               | 1    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1480  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | Frequencies |    | Instructor |   | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|------------|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                                           | NR          | NA | 1          | 2 |             |           |           |            |           | 3    | 4    | 5    | Mean | Rank |
| -----                                                     |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 7         | 8         | 4.53       | 632/1670  | 3.99 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 6         | 8         | 4.47       | 686/1666  | 4.21 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 1          | 1 | 1           | 4         | 8         | 4.13       | 972/1406  | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.13 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 6         | 9         | 4.60       | 446/1615  | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 5  | 0          | 0 | 2           | 5         | 3         | 4.10       | 790/1566  | 3.59 | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.03 | 4.10 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0          | 1 | 0           | 4         | 9         | 4.50       | 421/1528  | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 3           | 2         | 8         | 4.21       | 950/1650  | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.21 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 2         | 13        | 4.87       | 749/1667  | 4.84 | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 6         | 4         | 4.27       | 704/1626  | 3.86 | 3.94 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.27 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 2         | 12        | 4.86       | 355/1559  | 4.66 | 4.69 | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 13        | 4.93       | 477/1560  | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 13        | 4.93       | 161/1549  | 4.55 | 4.59 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.93 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 1  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 12        | 4.92       | 185/1546  | 4.47 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 1         | 12        | 4.79       | 167/1323  | 4.35 | 4.39 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.79 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 10          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 4         | 4.80       | 221/1384  | 3.93 | 3.96 | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 10          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 4         | 4.80       | 348/1378  | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 10          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 0         | 5         | 5.00       | 1/1378    | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.08 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 10          | 0  | 1          | 0 | 0           | 0         | 4         | 4.20       | 405/ 904  | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.94 | 4.20 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 11        | 4.92       | 16/ 232   | 4.56 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.92 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 11        | 4.92       | 22/ 239   | 4.68 | 4.70 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.92 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 11        | 4.92       | 39/ 230   | 4.86 | 4.88 | 4.44 | 4.58 | 4.92 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 11        | 4.92       | 36/ 231   | 4.89 | 4.85 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.92 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 0         | 12        | 5.00       | 1/ 218    | 4.80 | 4.82 | 4.18 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 3         | 0         | 4.00       | ****/ 87  | **** | **** | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 0         | 3         | 5.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 0  | 1          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 1         | 3.33       | ****/ 75  | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 3         | 0         | 4.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 2         | 1         | 4.33       | ****/ 80  | 4.20 | 4.20 | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 2         | 4.67       | ****/ 41  | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 2         | 4.67       | ****/ 38  | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.19 | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 1         | 2         | 4.67       | ****/ 38  | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 2         | 0         | 3.67       | ****/ 39  | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 12          | 2  | 0          | 0 | 0           | 0         | 1         | 5.00       | ****/ 31  | 3.80 | 3.80 | 4.47 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |            |   |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 2         | 0         | 3.67       | ****/ 28  | 3.60 | 3.60 | 4.64 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 1         | 1         | 4.00       | ****/ 16  | **** | **** | 4.67 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 1         | 1         | 4.00       | ****/ 27  | 4.40 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 2         | 0         | 3.67       | ****/ 10  | **** | **** | 4.84 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 12          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1           | 2         | 0         | 3.67       | ****/ 6   | **** | **** | 4.92 | 4.83 | **** |



Course-Section: SCI 100 0105  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1480  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 3 | Required for Majors | 11   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B               | 8 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C               | 3 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 15 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150         | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 1    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1481  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |    |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                                                           |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----                                                     |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1  | 0  | 1           | 3 | 6 | 6  | 1  | 3.18       | 1606/1670 | 3.99        | 3.95      | 4.31      | 4.23       | 3.18      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 5 | 7  | 5  | 4.00       | 1199/1666 | 4.21        | 4.24      | 4.27      | 4.30       | 4.00      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1  | 0  | 2           | 0 | 1 | 2  | 12 | 4.29       | 844/1406  | 4.10        | 4.19      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 4.29      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1  | 1  | 0           | 1 | 3 | 5  | 7  | 4.13       | 1009/1615 | 4.21        | 4.22      | 4.24      | 4.17       | 4.13      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 2  | 1  | 2           | 0 | 4 | 5  | 4  | 3.60       | 1230/1566 | 3.59        | 3.55      | 4.07      | 4.03       | 3.60      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1  | 0  | 2           | 0 | 6 | 4  | 5  | 3.59       | 1241/1528 | 4.00        | 4.01      | 4.12      | 4.00       | 3.59      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 3  | 11 | 4.47       | 615/1650  | 4.30        | 4.34      | 4.22      | 4.28       | 4.47      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2  | 15 | 4.88       | 712/1667  | 4.84        | 4.86      | 4.67      | 4.61       | 4.88      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0  | 3.83       | 1191/1626 | 3.86        | 3.94      | 4.11      | 4.07       | 3.83      |
| Lecture                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3  | 14 | 4.82       | 403/1559  | 4.66        | 4.69      | 4.46      | 4.47       | 4.82      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 16 | 4.94       | 358/1560  | 4.74        | 4.76      | 4.72      | 4.68       | 4.94      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 2  | 13 | 4.65       | 512/1549  | 4.55        | 4.59      | 4.31      | 4.32       | 4.65      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 4 | 5  | 8  | 4.24       | 1002/1546 | 4.47        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.32       | 4.24      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 5 | 5  | 7  | 4.12       | 648/1323  | 4.35        | 4.39      | 4.00      | 3.91       | 4.12      |
| Discussion                                                |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 7  | 0  | 2           | 1 | 2 | 2  | 4  | 3.45       | 1122/1384 | 3.93        | 3.96      | 4.10      | 3.92       | 3.45      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 7  | 0  | 1           | 1 | 3 | 1  | 5  | 3.73       | 1121/1378 | 4.16        | 4.21      | 4.29      | 4.09       | 3.73      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 4 | 1  | 6  | 4.18       | 904/1378  | 4.32        | 4.40      | 4.31      | 4.08       | 4.18      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7  | 2  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 3  | 3  | 4.00       | 461/ 904  | 4.07        | 4.02      | 4.03      | 3.94       | 4.00      |
| Laboratory                                                |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 4 | 3  | 7  | 4.07       | 141/ 232  | 4.56        | 4.60      | 4.19      | 4.25       | 4.07      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3  | 12 | 4.80       | 38/ 239   | 4.68        | 4.70      | 4.21      | 4.35       | 4.80      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 14 | 4.93       | 31/ 230   | 4.86        | 4.88      | 4.44      | 4.58       | 4.93      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 14 | 4.93       | 28/ 231   | 4.89        | 4.85      | 4.31      | 4.45       | 4.93      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 14 | 4.93       | 18/ 218   | 4.80        | 4.82      | 4.18      | 4.47       | 4.93      |
| Seminar                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00       | ****/ 87  | ****        | ****      | 4.65      | 4.67       | ****      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 5.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.60        | 4.60      | 4.64      | 4.72       | ****      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 16 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.00       | ****/ 75  | ****        | ****      | 4.57      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 16 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 4.45      | 4.59       | ****      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 1  | 4.50       | ****/ 80  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 3.97      | 3.99       | ****      |
| Field Work                                                |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 16 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.50       | ****/ 41  | 4.46        | 4.46      | 4.50      | 3.91       | ****      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 16 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.36        | 4.36      | 4.19      | 4.07       | ****      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 16 | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.71        | 4.71      | 4.62      | 4.63       | ****      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 16 | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 39  | 4.33        | 4.33      | 4.27      | 4.42       | ****      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 16 | 1  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1.00       | ****/ 31  | 3.80        | 3.80      | 4.47      | 4.28       | ****      |
| Self Paced                                                |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1.00       | ****/ 28  | 3.60        | 3.60      | 4.64      | 4.59       | ****      |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1481  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 6 | Required for Majors | 11   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 4 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 2 | General             | 1    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 1    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1482  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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 |      |      |
| -----                                                     |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2          | 8  | 4.06   | 1183/1670 | 3.99 | 3.95  | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.06 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4          | 9  | 4.25   | 967/1666  | 4.21 | 4.24  | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2          | 12 | 4.56   | 535/1406  | 4.10 | 4.19  | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4          | 7  | 4.00   | 1083/1615 | 4.21 | 4.22  | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3          | 5  | 3.67   | 1200/1566 | 3.59 | 3.55  | 4.07 | 4.03 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3          | 6  | 3.81   | 1113/1528 | 4.00 | 4.01  | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.81 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3          | 8  | 3.94   | 1235/1650 | 4.30 | 4.34  | 4.22 | 4.28 | 3.94 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0          | 12 | 4.50   | 1157/1667 | 4.84 | 4.86  | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 2  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6          | 3  | 3.85   | 1181/1626 | 3.86 | 3.94  | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.85 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0          | 9  | 4.29   | 1136/1559 | 4.66 | 4.69  | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2          | 9  | 4.43   | 1310/1560 | 4.74 | 4.76  | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.43 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2          | 7  | 4.14   | 1070/1549 | 4.55 | 4.59  | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 3  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2          | 6  | 4.08   | 1110/1546 | 4.47 | 4.51  | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.08 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3           | 1  | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2          | 5  | 3.83   | 871/1323  | 4.35 | 4.39  | 4.00 | 3.91 | 3.83 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3          | 6  | 4.50   | 434/1384  | 3.93 | 3.96  | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2          | 6  | 4.40   | 718/1378  | 4.16 | 4.21  | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2          | 5  | 4.20   | 899/1378  | 4.32 | 4.40  | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 6           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1          | 4  | 3.89   | 577/ 904  | 4.07 | 4.02  | 4.03 | 3.94 | 3.89 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2          | 8  | 4.64   | 61/ 232   | 4.56 | 4.60  | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.64 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4          | 6  | 4.45   | 98/ 239   | 4.68 | 4.70  | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.45 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 9  | 4.73   | 81/ 230   | 4.86 | 4.88  | 4.44 | 4.58 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2          | 8  | 4.64   | 90/ 231   | 4.89 | 4.85  | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.64 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 9  | 4.73   | 43/ 218   | 4.80 | 4.82  | 4.18 | 4.47 | 4.73 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 87  | **** | ****  | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 79  | 4.60 | 4.60  | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 75  | **** | ****  | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 79  | 4.20 | 4.20  | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 80  | 4.20 | 4.20  | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 41  | 4.46 | 4.46  | 4.50 | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 38  | 4.36 | 4.36  | 4.19 | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 38  | 4.71 | 4.71  | 4.62 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 39  | 4.33 | 4.33  | 4.27 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0  | 4.00   | ****/ 31  | 3.80 | 3.80  | 4.47 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 28  | 3.60 | 3.60  | 4.64 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0  | 4.00   | ****/ 16  | **** | ****  | 4.67 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0  | 4.00   | ****/ 27  | 4.40 | 4.40  | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0  | 4.00   | ****/ 10  | **** | ****  | 4.84 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 6   | **** | ****  | 4.92 | 4.83 | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1482  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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               | 6 | Required for Majors | 14   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B               | 6 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C               | 3 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 16 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150         | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | 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 100 0204  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1483  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                                                           |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----                                                     |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 7 | 5 | 7  | 3.85       | 1379/1670 | 3.99        | 3.95      | 4.31      | 4.23       | 3.85      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 4.60       | 490/1666  | 4.21        | 4.24      | 4.27      | 4.30       | 4.60      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 4.75       | 318/1406  | 4.10        | 4.19      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 4.75      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.50       | 552/1615  | 4.21        | 4.22      | 4.24      | 4.17       | 4.50      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 0  | 3           | 2 | 4 | 3 | 8  | 3.55       | 1257/1566 | 3.59        | 3.55      | 4.07      | 4.03       | 3.55      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1  | 0  | 2           | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.21       | 742/1528  | 4.00        | 4.01      | 4.12      | 4.00       | 4.21      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0           | 4 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.15       | 1020/1650 | 4.30        | 4.34      | 4.22      | 4.28       | 4.15      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5.00       | 1/1667    | 4.84        | 4.86      | 4.67      | 4.61       | 5.00      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3  | 4.09       | 905/1626  | 3.86        | 3.94      | 4.11      | 4.07       | 4.09      |
| Lecture                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82       | 403/1559  | 4.66        | 4.69      | 4.46      | 4.47       | 4.82      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88       | 673/1560  | 4.74        | 4.76      | 4.72      | 4.68       | 4.88      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67       | 488/1549  | 4.55        | 4.59      | 4.31      | 4.32       | 4.67      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.63       | 570/1546  | 4.47        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.32       | 4.63      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 4  | 0  | 0           | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8  | 4.13       | 641/1323  | 4.35        | 4.39      | 4.00      | 3.91       | 4.13      |
| Discussion                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 9  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 4.55       | 409/1384  | 3.93        | 3.96      | 4.10      | 3.92       | 4.55      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 9  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9  | 4.73       | 431/1378  | 4.16        | 4.21      | 4.29      | 4.09       | 4.73      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 9  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82       | 375/1378  | 4.32        | 4.40      | 4.31      | 4.08       | 4.82      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 9  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7  | 4.27       | 361/ 904  | 4.07        | 4.02      | 4.03      | 3.94       | 4.27      |
| Laboratory                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9  | 4.47       | 83/ 232   | 4.56        | 4.60      | 4.19      | 4.25       | 4.47      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.76       | 46/ 239   | 4.68        | 4.70      | 4.21      | 4.35       | 4.76      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94       | 26/ 230   | 4.86        | 4.88      | 4.44      | 4.58       | 4.94      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94       | 24/ 231   | 4.89        | 4.85      | 4.31      | 4.45       | 4.94      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00       | 1/ 218    | 4.80        | 4.82      | 4.18      | 4.47       | 5.00      |
| Seminar                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 87  | ****        | ****      | 4.65      | 4.67       | ****      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.60        | 4.60      | 4.64      | 4.72       | ****      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 75  | ****        | ****      | 4.57      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 4.45      | 4.59       | ****      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 80  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 3.97      | 3.99       | ****      |
| Field Work                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 41  | 4.46        | 4.46      | 4.50      | 3.91       | ****      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.36        | 4.36      | 4.19      | 4.07       | ****      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.71        | 4.71      | 4.62      | 4.63       | ****      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |    | Reasons             |  | Type |                                                               | Majors |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|--|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 12 | Required for Majors |  | 15   | Graduate                                                      | 0      | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 5  |                     |  |      |                                                               |        |           |    |
| 56-83          | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C               | 1  | General             |  | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 20     | Non-major | 20 |
| 84-150         | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D               | 0  |                     |  |      |                                                               |        |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F               | 0  | Electives           |  | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |        |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0  |                     |  |      |                                                               |        |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0  | Other               |  | 4    |                                                               |        |           |    |



Course-Section: SCI 100 0205  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1484  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |    |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                                                           |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----                                                     |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0  | 0  | 1           | 1 | 5 | 8  | 4  | 3.68       | 1478/1670 | 3.99        | 3.95      | 4.31      | 4.23       | 3.68      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7  | 4.37       | 833/1666  | 4.21        | 4.24      | 4.27      | 4.30       | 4.37      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 7  | 8  | 4.35       | 775/1406  | 4.10        | 4.19      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 4.35      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 4 | 8  | 7  | 4.16       | 981/1615  | 4.21        | 4.22      | 4.24      | 4.17       | 4.16      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 3  | 1           | 3 | 4 | 4  | 4  | 3.44       | 1329/1566 | 3.59        | 3.55      | 4.07      | 4.03       | 3.44      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 0  | 3           | 2 | 4 | 5  | 5  | 3.37       | 1351/1528 | 4.00        | 4.01      | 4.12      | 4.00       | 3.37      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6  | 11 | 4.47       | 615/1650  | 4.30        | 4.34      | 4.22      | 4.28       | 4.47      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 3  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 15 | 4.94       | 472/1667  | 4.84        | 4.86      | 4.67      | 4.61       | 4.94      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 3 | 9  | 3  | 3.88       | 1152/1626 | 3.86        | 3.94      | 4.11      | 4.07       | 3.88      |
| Lecture                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4  | 15 | 4.79       | 469/1559  | 4.66        | 4.69      | 4.46      | 4.47       | 4.79      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4  | 15 | 4.79       | 892/1560  | 4.74        | 4.76      | 4.72      | 4.68       | 4.79      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 2 | 4  | 12 | 4.42       | 789/1549  | 4.55        | 4.59      | 4.31      | 4.32       | 4.42      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6  | 10 | 4.44       | 795/1546  | 4.47        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.32       | 4.44      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 4 | 4  | 10 | 4.33       | 481/1323  | 4.35        | 4.39      | 4.00      | 3.91       | 4.33      |
| Discussion                                                |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 9  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 3 | 1  | 5  | 3.90       | 932/1384  | 3.93        | 3.96      | 4.10      | 3.92       | 3.90      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 9  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 3  | 5  | 4.10       | 932/1378  | 4.16        | 4.21      | 4.29      | 4.09       | 4.10      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 9  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 2 | 2  | 5  | 4.00       | 977/1378  | 4.32        | 4.40      | 4.31      | 4.08       | 4.00      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 9  | 1  | 1           | 0 | 2 | 3  | 3  | 3.78       | 619/ 904  | 4.07        | 4.02      | 4.03      | 3.94       | 3.78      |
| Laboratory                                                |    |    |             |   |   |    |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 7  | 4.88       | 22/ 232   | 4.56        | 4.60      | 4.19      | 4.25       | 4.88      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1  | 6  | 4.63       | 67/ 239   | 4.68        | 4.70      | 4.21      | 4.35       | 4.63      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 7  | 4.88       | 49/ 230   | 4.86        | 4.88      | 4.44      | 4.58       | 4.88      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 7  | 4.88       | 45/ 231   | 4.89        | 4.85      | 4.31      | 4.45       | 4.88      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 7  | 4.88       | 27/ 218   | 4.80        | 4.82      | 4.18      | 4.47       | 4.88      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |    | Reasons             |    | Type                                                          |    | Majors    |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| -----          |   |           |   |                 |    |                     |    |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 00-27          | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 4  | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 11 |                     |    |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C               | 0  | General             | 0  | Under-grad                                                    | 19 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150         | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D               | 0  |                     |    |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F               | 0  | Electives           | 0  | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0  |                     |    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0  | Other               | 1  |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0  |                     |    |                                                               |    |           |    |



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 | 4      | 6    | 6    | 3.89  | 1358/1670 | 3.99 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 3.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 9      | 1    | 8    | 3.94  | 1270/1666 | 4.21 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 3.94 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0          | 3 | 2      | 8    | 5    | 3.83  | 1169/1406 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.83 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 1          | 1 | 2      | 7    | 6    | 3.94  | 1173/1615 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 3.94 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 6  | 1          | 1 | 3      | 1    | 5    | 3.73  | 1166/1566 | 3.59 | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.03 | 3.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 2  | 1          | 0 | 2      | 8    | 4    | 3.93  | 997/1528  | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.93 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0          | 2 | 3      | 4    | 8    | 4.06  | 1107/1650 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.06 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 2  | 1          | 1 | 0      | 1    | 13   | 4.50  | 1157/1667 | 4.84 | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 1  | 0          | 0 | 4      | 11   | 1    | 3.81  | 1210/1626 | 3.86 | 3.94 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.66 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0          | 2 | 3      | 1    | 12   | 4.28  | 1143/1559 | 4.66 | 4.69 | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.28 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0          | 2 | 1      | 3    | 12   | 4.39  | 1340/1560 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.39 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 2      | 6    | 9    | 4.28  | 960/1549  | 4.55 | 4.59 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.28 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 3  | 0          | 2 | 1      | 0    | 12   | 4.47  | 768/1546  | 4.47 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 1  | 0          | 0 | 4      | 5    | 8    | 4.24  | 560/1323  | 4.35 | 4.39 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 4           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 4      | 1    | 8    | 4.14  | 758/1384  | 3.93 | 3.96 | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.14 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 4           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 2      | 3    | 9    | 4.50  | 603/1378  | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 1      | 1    | 10   | 4.54  | 634/1378  | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.54 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 4           | 5  | 1          | 0 | 1      | 2    | 5    | 4.11  | 437/ 904  | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.94 | 4.11 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 7           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 1      | 3    | 6    | 4.27  | 112/ 232  | 4.56 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.27 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 0      | 0    | 10   | 4.73  | 54/ 239   | 4.68 | 4.70 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.73 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 7           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 10   | 4.91  | 44/ 230   | 4.86 | 4.88 | 4.44 | 4.58 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 7           | 1  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 9    | 4.90  | 40/ 231   | 4.89 | 4.85 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.90 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 7           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 0      | 0    | 10   | 4.73  | 43/ 218   | 4.80 | 4.82 | 4.18 | 4.47 | 4.73 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 15          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 2    | 4.67  | ****/ 87  | **** | **** | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 15          | 0  | 0          | 1 | 0      | 0    | 2    | 4.00  | ****/ 79  | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 15          | 0  | 0          | 1 | 0      | 0    | 2    | 4.00  | ****/ 75  | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 15          | 0  | 1          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 2    | 3.67  | ****/ 79  | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 15          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 0    | 2    | 4.33  | ****/ 80  | 4.20 | 4.20 | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 11          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 2    | 5    | 4.71  | 30/ 41    | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.91 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 11          | 0  | 1          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 5    | 4.29  | 24/ 38    | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.19 | 4.07 | 4.29 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 11          | 1  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 0    | 5    | 4.67  | 22/ 38    | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.63 | 4.67 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 11          | 1  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 2    | 3    | 4.33  | 21/ 39    | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 11          | 2  | 1          | 0 | 1      | 0    | 3    | 3.80  | 27/ 31    | 3.80 | 3.80 | 4.47 | 4.28 | 3.80 |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 15          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 3    | 5.00  | ****/ 28  | 3.60 | 3.60 | 4.64 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 15          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 2    | 4.67  | ****/ 16  | **** | **** | 4.67 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 15          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 0    | 2    | 4.33  | ****/ 27  | 4.40 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 15          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 2    | 4.67  | ****/ 10  | **** | **** | 4.84 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 15          | 1  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 2    | 5.00  | ****/ 6   | **** | **** | 4.92 | 4.83 | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1485  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 6 | Required for Majors | 10   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 6 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C               | 3 | General             | 1    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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               | 3    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1486  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR NA |   | Frequencies |   |   |      |      | Instructor |           | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------|---|-------------|---|---|------|------|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|                                                           | 1     | 2 | 3           | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean       | Mean      | Mean   | Mean | Mean |       |      |
| -----                                                     |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| General                                                   |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0     | 0 | 0           | 2 | 4 | 6    | 6    | 3.89       | 1358/1670 | 3.99   | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.23  | 3.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 9 | 1    | 8    | 3.94       | 1270/1666 | 4.21   | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.30  | 3.94 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0     | 0 | 0           | 3 | 2 | 8    | 5    | 3.83       | 1169/1406 | 4.10   | 4.19 | 4.32 | 4.31  | 3.83 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0     | 1 | 1           | 1 | 2 | 7    | 6    | 3.94       | 1173/1615 | 4.21   | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.17  | 3.94 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1     | 6 | 1           | 1 | 3 | 1    | 5    | 3.73       | 1166/1566 | 3.59   | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.03  | 3.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1     | 2 | 1           | 0 | 2 | 8    | 4    | 3.93       | 997/1528  | 4.00   | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.00  | 3.93 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1     | 0 | 0           | 2 | 3 | 4    | 8    | 4.06       | 1107/1650 | 4.30   | 4.34 | 4.22 | 4.28  | 4.06 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0     | 2 | 1           | 1 | 0 | 1    | 13   | 4.50       | 1157/1667 | 4.84   | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.61  | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 12    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 3 | 3    | 0    | 3.50       | 1384/1626 | 3.86   | 3.94 | 4.11 | 4.07  | 3.66 |
| Lecture                                                   |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 15    | 0 | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 2    | 3.67       | ****/1559 | 4.66   | 4.69 | 4.46 | 4.47  | 4.28 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3    | 5.00       | ****/1560 | 4.74   | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.68  | 4.39 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3    | 5.00       | ****/1549 | 4.55   | 4.59 | 4.31 | 4.32  | 4.28 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3    | 5.00       | ****/1546 | 4.47   | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.32  | 4.47 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3    | 5.00       | ****/1323 | 4.35   | 4.39 | 4.00 | 3.91  | 4.24 |
| Discussion                                                |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 4     | 0 | 0           | 1 | 4 | 1    | 8    | 4.14       | 758/1384  | 3.93   | 3.96 | 4.10 | 3.92  | 4.14 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 4     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3    | 9    | 4.50       | 603/1378  | 4.16   | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.09  | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5     | 0 | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1    | 10   | 4.54       | 634/1378  | 4.32   | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.08  | 4.54 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 4     | 5 | 1           | 0 | 1 | 2    | 5    | 4.11       | 437/ 904  | 4.07   | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.94  | 4.11 |
| Laboratory                                                |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 7     | 0 | 0           | 1 | 1 | 3    | 6    | 4.27       | 112/ 232  | 4.56   | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.25  | 4.27 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7     | 0 | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0    | 10   | 4.73       | 54/ 239   | 4.68   | 4.70 | 4.21 | 4.35  | 4.73 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 7     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1    | 10   | 4.91       | 44/ 230   | 4.86   | 4.88 | 4.44 | 4.58  | 4.91 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 7     | 1 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1    | 9    | 4.90       | 40/ 231   | 4.89   | 4.85 | 4.31 | 4.45  | 4.90 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 7     | 0 | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0    | 10   | 4.73       | 43/ 218   | 4.80   | 4.82 | 4.18 | 4.47  | 4.73 |
| Seminar                                                   |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1    | 2    | 4.67       | ****/ 87  | ****   | **** | 4.65 | 4.67  | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 15    | 0 | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0    | 2    | 4.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.60   | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.72  | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 15    | 0 | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0    | 2    | 4.00       | ****/ 75  | ****   | **** | 4.57 | 4.46  | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 15    | 0 | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 2    | 3.67       | ****/ 79  | 4.20   | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.59  | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0    | 2    | 4.33       | ****/ 80  | 4.20   | 4.20 | 3.97 | 3.99  | **** |
| Field Work                                                |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 11    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2    | 5    | 4.71       | 30/ 41    | 4.46   | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.91  | 4.71 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 11    | 0 | 1           | 0 | 0 | 1    | 5    | 4.29       | 24/ 38    | 4.36   | 4.36 | 4.19 | 4.07  | 4.29 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 11    | 1 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0    | 5    | 4.67       | 22/ 38    | 4.71   | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.63  | 4.67 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 11    | 1 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2    | 3    | 4.33       | 21/ 39    | 4.33   | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.42  | 4.33 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 11    | 2 | 1           | 0 | 1 | 0    | 3    | 3.80       | 27/ 31    | 3.80   | 3.80 | 4.47 | 4.28  | 3.80 |
| Self Paced                                                |       |   |             |   |   |      |      |            |           |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3    | 5.00       | ****/ 28  | 3.60   | 3.60 | 4.64 | 4.59  | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1    | 2    | 4.67       | ****/ 16  | ****   | **** | 4.67 | 4.83  | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0    | 2    | 4.33       | ****/ 27  | 4.40   | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.46  | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 15    | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1    | 2    | 4.67       | ****/ 10  | ****   | **** | 4.84 | 4.75  | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 15    | 1 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0    | 2    | 5.00       | ****/ 6   | ****   | **** | 4.92 | 4.83  | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1486  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 6 | Required for Majors | 10   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 6 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C               | 3 | General             | 1    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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               | 3    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1487  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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 | 3      | 7    | 8    | 4.28  | 974/1670  | 3.99 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.28 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0          | 1 | 3      | 10   | 4    | 3.94  | 1270/1666 | 4.21 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 3.94 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 1          | 3 | 5      | 6    | 3    | 3.39  | 1309/1406 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.39 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 3      | 7    | 8    | 4.28  | 849/1615  | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.28 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 7  | 1          | 1 | 4      | 3    | 2    | 3.36  | 1362/1566 | 3.59 | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.03 | 3.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 1  | 0          | 1 | 1      | 9    | 5    | 4.13  | 823/1528  | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 1          | 0 | 1      | 7    | 9    | 4.28  | 879/1650  | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.28 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 6    | 12   | 4.67  | 1022/1667 | 4.84 | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 1  | 0          | 0 | 3      | 8    | 4    | 4.07  | 921/1626  | 3.86 | 3.94 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.07 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 5    | 13   | 4.72  | 572/1559  | 4.66 | 4.69 | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 4    | 14   | 4.78  | 911/1560  | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 7    | 10   | 4.50  | 683/1549  | 4.55 | 4.59 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 2      | 4    | 12   | 4.56  | 655/1546  | 4.47 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 1  | 0          | 1 | 0      | 6    | 10   | 4.47  | 355/1323  | 4.35 | 4.39 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.47 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 10          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 4    | 3    | 4.25  | 670/1384  | 3.93 | 3.96 | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 10          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 4    | 4    | 4.50  | 603/1378  | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 11          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 3    | 3    | 4.29  | 850/1378  | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.29 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 11          | 4  | 0          | 0 | 1      | 0    | 2    | 4.33  | ****/ 904 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.03 | 3.94 | **** |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 2           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 2      | 6    | 8    | 4.38  | 95/ 232   | 4.56 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.38 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 8    | 8    | 4.50  | 85/ 239   | 4.68 | 4.70 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 2           | 1  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 3    | 12   | 4.80  | 63/ 230   | 4.86 | 4.88 | 4.44 | 4.58 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 2           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 4    | 12   | 4.75  | 69/ 231   | 4.89 | 4.85 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.75 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 2           | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 4    | 12   | 4.75  | 39/ 218   | 4.80 | 4.82 | 4.18 | 4.47 | 4.75 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 0    | 4.00  | ****/ 87  | **** | **** | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 79  | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 75  | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 79  | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 80  | 4.20 | 4.20 | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 1    | 0    | 4.00  | ****/ 41  | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 38  | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.19 | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 38  | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 39  | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 31  | 3.80 | 3.80 | 4.47 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |            |   |        |      |      |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 28  | 3.60 | 3.60 | 4.64 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 16  | **** | **** | 4.67 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 27  | 4.40 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 10  | **** | **** | 4.84 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 17          | 0  | 0          | 0 | 0      | 0    | 1    | 5.00  | ****/ 6   | **** | **** | 4.92 | 4.83 | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1487  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A               | 6 | Required for Majors | 12   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 9 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C               | 1 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 2 | 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               | 3    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1488  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                                                           |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----                                                     |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7  | 4.06       | 1189/1670 | 3.99        | 3.95      | 4.31      | 4.23       | 4.06      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 1           | 3 | 0 | 7 | 6  | 3.82       | 1370/1666 | 4.21        | 4.24      | 4.27      | 4.30       | 3.82      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3  | 3.59       | 1255/1406 | 4.10        | 4.19      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 3.59      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1  | 1  | 0           | 2 | 2 | 7 | 5  | 3.94       | 1188/1615 | 4.21        | 4.22      | 4.24      | 4.17       | 3.94      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1  | 5  | 0           | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1  | 3.33       | 1373/1566 | 3.59        | 3.55      | 4.07      | 4.03       | 3.33      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4  | 3.88       | 1063/1528 | 4.00        | 4.01      | 4.12      | 4.00       | 3.88      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8  | 4.41       | 705/1650  | 4.30        | 4.34      | 4.22      | 4.28       | 4.41      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94       | 405/1667  | 4.84        | 4.86      | 4.67      | 4.61       | 4.94      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5  | 1  | 0           | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1  | 3.50       | 1384/1626 | 3.86        | 3.94      | 4.11      | 4.07       | 3.50      |
| Lecture                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65       | 706/1559  | 4.66        | 4.69      | 4.46      | 4.47       | 4.65      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.76       | 929/1560  | 4.74        | 4.76      | 4.72      | 4.68       | 4.76      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7  | 4.40       | 816/1549  | 4.55        | 4.59      | 4.31      | 4.32       | 4.40      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 7 | 6  | 4.19       | 1040/1546 | 4.47        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.32       | 4.19      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5  | 3.93       | 781/1323  | 4.35        | 4.39      | 4.00      | 3.91       | 3.93      |
| Discussion                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 10 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2  | 3.75       | 996/1384  | 3.93        | 3.96      | 4.10      | 3.92       | 3.75      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 10 | 0  | 1           | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2  | 3.25       | 1265/1378 | 4.16        | 4.21      | 4.29      | 4.09       | 3.25      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 10 | 0  | 1           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2  | 3.38       | 1240/1378 | 4.32        | 4.40      | 4.31      | 4.08       | 3.38      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 10 | 2  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2  | 4.00       | 461/ 904  | 4.07        | 4.02      | 4.03      | 3.94       | 4.00      |
| Laboratory                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9  | 4.53       | 75/ 232   | 4.56        | 4.60      | 4.19      | 4.25       | 4.53      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60       | 70/ 239   | 4.68        | 4.70      | 4.21      | 4.35       | 4.60      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73       | 79/ 230   | 4.86        | 4.88      | 4.44      | 4.58       | 4.73      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86       | 49/ 231   | 4.89        | 4.85      | 4.31      | 4.45       | 4.86      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67       | 52/ 218   | 4.80        | 4.82      | 4.18      | 4.47       | 4.67      |
| Seminar                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 12 | 2  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 3.50       | ****/ 87  | ****        | ****      | 4.65      | 4.67       | ****      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 13 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3  | 4.60       | 52/ 79    | 4.60        | 4.60      | 4.64      | 4.72       | 4.60      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 13 | 1  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 3.25       | ****/ 75  | ****        | ****      | 4.57      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 13 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2  | 4.20       | 58/ 79    | 4.20        | 4.20      | 4.45      | 4.59       | 4.20      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 13 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2  | 4.20       | 34/ 80    | 4.20        | 4.20      | 3.97      | 3.99       | 4.20      |
| Field Work                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 11 | 0  | 0           | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2  | 3.43       | 37/ 41    | 4.46        | 4.46      | 4.50      | 3.91       | 3.43      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 11 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2  | 3.86       | 28/ 38    | 4.36        | 4.36      | 4.19      | 4.07       | 3.86      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 12 | 2  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 4.50       | ****/ 38  | 4.71        | 4.71      | 4.62      | 4.63       | ****      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 13 | 2  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00       | ****/ 39  | 4.33        | 4.33      | 4.27      | 4.42       | ****      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 12 | 2  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 4.50       | ****/ 31  | 3.80        | 3.80      | 4.47      | 4.28       | ****      |
| Self Paced                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 13 | 0  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2  | 3.60       | 26/ 28    | 3.60        | 3.60      | 4.64      | 4.59       | 3.60      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 13 | 2  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2  | 4.67       | ****/ 16  | ****        | ****      | 4.67      | 4.83       | ****      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 13 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3  | 4.40       | 20/ 27    | 4.40        | 4.40      | 4.54      | 4.46       | 4.40      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 13 | 1  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 4.50       | ****/ 10  | ****        | ****      | 4.84      | 4.75       | ****      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 13 | 1  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2  | 3.75       | ****/ 6   | ****        | ****      | 4.92      | 4.83       | ****      |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1488  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 6 | Required for Majors | 12   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 5 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C               | 4 | General             | 1    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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               | 5    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |



Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1489  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                                                           |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----                                                     |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5  | 3.94       | 1292/1670 | 3.99        | 3.95      | 4.31      | 4.23       | 3.94      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 2 | 7 | 7  | 4.18       | 1059/1666 | 4.21        | 4.24      | 4.27      | 4.30       | 4.18      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 2  | 0  | 1           | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7  | 3.88       | 1147/1406 | 4.10        | 4.19      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 3.88      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4  | 3.88       | 1246/1615 | 4.21        | 4.22      | 4.24      | 4.17       | 3.88      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1  | 6  | 0           | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4  | 3.91       | 1010/1566 | 3.59        | 3.55      | 4.07      | 4.03       | 3.91      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1  | 0  | 1           | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4  | 3.76       | 1146/1528 | 4.00        | 4.01      | 4.12      | 4.00       | 3.76      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 4.24       | 926/1650  | 4.30        | 4.34      | 4.22      | 4.28       | 4.24      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 4.82       | 823/1667  | 4.84        | 4.86      | 4.67      | 4.61       | 4.82      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2  | 3.85       | 1181/1626 | 3.86        | 3.94      | 4.11      | 4.07       | 3.85      |
| Lecture                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60       | 772/1559  | 4.66        | 4.69      | 4.46      | 4.47       | 4.60      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 4.67       | 1090/1560 | 4.74        | 4.76      | 4.72      | 4.68       | 4.67      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60       | 562/1549  | 4.55        | 4.59      | 4.31      | 4.32       | 4.60      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9  | 4.53       | 679/1546  | 4.47        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.32       | 4.53      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 4  | 1  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9  | 4.46       | 364/1323  | 4.35        | 4.39      | 4.00      | 3.91       | 4.46      |
| Discussion                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 12 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1  | 3.50       | 1103/1384 | 3.93        | 3.96      | 4.10      | 3.92       | 3.50      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 12 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2  | 4.00       | 970/1378  | 4.16        | 4.21      | 4.29      | 4.09       | 4.00      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 12 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4.33       | 813/1378  | 4.32        | 4.40      | 4.31      | 4.08       | 4.33      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 12 | 0  | 0           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1  | 3.50       | 718/ 904  | 4.07        | 4.02      | 4.03      | 3.94       | 3.50      |
| Laboratory                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 8  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8  | 4.60       | 64/ 232   | 4.56        | 4.60      | 4.19      | 4.25       | 4.60      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8  | 4.70       | 59/ 239   | 4.68        | 4.70      | 4.21      | 4.35       | 4.70      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 8  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00       | 1/ 230    | 4.86        | 4.88      | 4.44      | 4.58       | 5.00      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 8  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9  | 5.00       | 1/ 231    | 4.89        | 4.85      | 4.31      | 4.45       | 5.00      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 8  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 4.80       | 32/ 218   | 4.80        | 4.82      | 4.18      | 4.47       | 4.80      |
| Seminar                                                   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 87  | ****        | ****      | 4.65      | 4.67       | ****      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.60        | 4.60      | 4.64      | 4.72       | ****      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2.00       | ****/ 75  | ****        | ****      | 4.57      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 79  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 4.45      | 4.59       | ****      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 80  | 4.20        | 4.20      | 3.97      | 3.99       | ****      |
| Field Work                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50       | ****/ 41  | 4.46        | 4.46      | 4.50      | 3.91       | ****      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 16 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.36        | 4.36      | 4.19      | 4.07       | ****      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 16 | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 38  | 4.71        | 4.71      | 4.62      | 4.63       | ****      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50       | ****/ 39  | 4.33        | 4.33      | 4.27      | 4.42       | ****      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50       | ****/ 31  | 3.80        | 3.80      | 4.47      | 4.28       | ****      |
| Self Paced                                                |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 28  | 3.60        | 3.60      | 4.64      | 4.59       | ****      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00       | ****/ 16  | ****        | ****      | 4.67      | 4.83       | ****      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 27  | 4.40        | 4.40      | 4.54      | 4.46       | ****      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 10  | ****        | ****      | 4.84      | 4.75       | ****      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00       | ****/ 6   | ****        | ****      | 4.92      | 4.83       | ****      |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1489  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 5 | Required for Majors | 13   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 8 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 1 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 1    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 1 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0305  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1490  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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 |      |
| -----                                                     |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7          | 10 | 4.50   | 665/1670  | 3.99 | 3.95  | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3          | 13 | 4.61   | 477/1666  | 4.21 | 4.24  | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.61 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5          | 11 | 4.39   | 739/1406  | 4.10 | 4.19  | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.39 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6          | 11 | 4.56   | 499/1615  | 4.21 | 4.22  | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 2  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3          | 10 | 4.31   | 579/1566  | 3.59 | 3.55  | 4.07 | 4.03 | 4.31 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7          | 10 | 4.50   | 421/1528  | 4.00 | 4.01  | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4          | 12 | 4.56   | 499/1650  | 4.30 | 4.34  | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 18 | 5.00   | 1/1667    | 4.84 | 4.86  | 4.67 | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8          | 3  | 3.86   | 1172/1626 | 3.86 | 3.94  | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.86 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 17 | 4.94   | 166/1559  | 4.66 | 4.69  | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.94 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 18 | 5.00   | 1/1560    | 4.74 | 4.76  | 4.72 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2          | 15 | 4.78   | 337/1549  | 4.55 | 4.59  | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5          | 13 | 4.72   | 445/1546  | 4.47 | 4.51  | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.72 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4          | 12 | 4.65   | 248/1323  | 4.35 | 4.39  | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.65 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3          | 8  | 4.73   | 278/1384  | 3.93 | 3.96  | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.73 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1          | 8  | 4.55   | 571/1378  | 4.16 | 4.21  | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3          | 8  | 4.73   | 470/1378  | 4.32 | 4.40  | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.73 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7           | 4  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0          | 5  | 4.29   | 356/ 904  | 4.07 | 4.02  | 4.03 | 3.94 | 4.29 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 12 | 5.00   | 1/ 232    | 4.56 | 4.60  | 4.19 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 11 | 4.92   | 22/ 239   | 4.68 | 4.70  | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.92 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 12 | 5.00   | 1/ 230    | 4.86 | 4.88  | 4.44 | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 12 | 5.00   | 1/ 231    | 4.89 | 4.85  | 4.31 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 11 | 4.92   | 23/ 218   | 4.80 | 4.82  | 4.18 | 4.47 | 4.92 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 4  | 5.00   | ****/ 87  | **** | ****  | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3  | 4.75   | ****/ 79  | 4.60 | 4.60  | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 2  | 4.50   | ****/ 75  | **** | ****  | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3  | 4.75   | ****/ 79  | 4.20 | 4.20  | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3  | 4.75   | ****/ 80  | 4.20 | 4.20  | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 5  | 5.00   | 1/ 41     | 4.46 | 4.46  | 4.50 | 3.91 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 5  | 5.00   | 1/ 38     | 4.36 | 4.36  | 4.19 | 4.07 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4  | 4.80   | 20/ 38    | 4.71 | 4.71  | 4.62 | 4.63 | 4.80 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 13          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3  | 4.75   | ****/ 39  | 4.33 | 4.33  | 4.27 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 13          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3  | 4.75   | ****/ 31  | 3.80 | 3.80  | 4.47 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 1  | 4.33   | ****/ 28  | 3.60 | 3.60  | 4.64 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 1  | 4.33   | ****/ 16  | **** | ****  | 4.67 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2  | 4.67   | ****/ 27  | 4.40 | 4.40  | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2  | 4.67   | ****/ 10  | **** | ****  | 4.84 | 4.75 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 15          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2  | 4.67   | ****/ 6   | **** | ****  | 4.92 | 4.83 | **** |

Course-Section: SCI 100 0305  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES, NORMAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1490  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors                                                        |    |           |    |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 6 | Required for Majors | 13   | Graduate                                                      | 0  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 7 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 2 | General             | 0    | Under-grad                                                    | 18 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150         | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 4    |                                                               |    |           |    |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 3 |                     |      |                                                               |    |           |    |

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1491  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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 |      |      |
| -----                                                     |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3          | 2  | 3.64   | 1498/1670 | 3.64 | 3.95  | 4.31 | 4.23 | 3.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 6  | 4.40   | 784/1666  | 4.40 | 4.24  | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 9  | 4.90   | 191/1406  | 4.90 | 4.19  | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4          | 5  | 4.30   | 813/1615  | 4.30 | 4.22  | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1          | 3  | 3.30   | 1385/1566 | 3.30 | 3.55  | 4.07 | 4.03 | 3.30 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4          | 4  | 4.10   | 842/1528  | 4.10 | 4.01  | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2          | 7  | 4.60   | 429/1650  | 4.60 | 4.34  | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 10 | 5.00   | 1/1667    | 5.00 | 4.86  | 4.67 | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4          | 5  | 4.56   | 363/1626  | 4.61 | 3.94  | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.61 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 8  | 4.80   | 435/1559  | 4.90 | 4.69  | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 8  | 4.80   | 855/1560  | 4.90 | 4.76  | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 7  | 4.78   | 337/1549  | 4.89 | 4.59  | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2          | 7  | 4.60   | 595/1546  | 4.80 | 4.51  | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2          | 6  | 4.40   | 423/1323  | 4.70 | 4.39  | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.70 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4          | 1  | 4.20   | 712/1384  | 4.20 | 3.96  | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 3  | 4.60   | 525/1378  | 4.60 | 4.21  | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 5  | 5.00   | 1/1378    | 5.00 | 4.40  | 4.31 | 4.08 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 6           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 1  | 3.80   | 605/ 904  | 3.80 | 4.02  | 4.03 | 3.94 | 3.80 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 7  | 4.88   | 22/ 232   | 4.88 | 4.60  | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 7  | 4.88   | 28/ 239   | 4.88 | 4.70  | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.88 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 8  | 5.00   | 1/ 230    | 5.00 | 4.88  | 4.44 | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1          | 7  | 4.56   | 104/ 231  | 4.56 | 4.85  | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.56 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 9  | 5.00   | 1/ 218    | 5.00 | 4.82  | 4.18 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2  | 5.00   | ****/ 87  | **** | ****  | 4.65 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00   | ****/ 79  | **** | 4.60  | 4.64 | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 1  | 4.00   | ****/ 75  | **** | ****  | 4.57 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 9           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 3.50   | ****/ 79  | **** | 4.20  | 4.45 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 1  | 4.00   | ****/ 80  | **** | 4.20  | 3.97 | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0  | 4.00   | ****/ 38  | **** | 4.71  | 4.62 | 4.63 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 10          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0          | 0  | 2.00   | ****/ 27  | **** | 4.40  | 4.54 | 4.46 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors                |                                                               |              |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A 5  | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 0                                                    | Major 0      |
| 28-55          | 2        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B 3  |                       |                                                               |              |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C 1  | General 0             | Under-grad 11                                                 | Non-major 11 |
| 84-150         | 3        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | D 0  |                       |                                                               |              |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 5       | 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 WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1492  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions                                                 | Frequencies |    |   |   |   | Instructor |    | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------|------|
|                                                           | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4          | 5  |             |           |           |            |           | Mean | Rank |
| -----                                                     |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| General                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3          | 2  | 3.64        | 1498/1670 | 3.64      | 3.95       | 4.31      | 4.23 | 3.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 6  | 4.40        | 784/1666  | 4.40      | 4.24       | 4.27      | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 9  | 4.90        | 191/1406  | 4.90      | 4.19       | 4.32      | 4.31 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4          | 5  | 4.30        | 813/1615  | 4.30      | 4.22       | 4.24      | 4.17 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1          | 3  | 3.30        | 1385/1566 | 3.30      | 3.55       | 4.07      | 4.03 | 3.30 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4          | 4  | 4.10        | 842/1528  | 4.10      | 4.01       | 4.12      | 4.00 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2          | 7  | 4.60        | 429/1650  | 4.60      | 4.34       | 4.22      | 4.28 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 10 | 5.00        | 1/1667    | 5.00      | 4.86       | 4.67      | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2  | 4.67        | 278/1626  | 4.61      | 3.94       | 4.11      | 4.07 | 4.61 |
| Lecture                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3  | 5.00        | 1/1559    | 4.90      | 4.69       | 4.46      | 4.47 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3  | 5.00        | 1/1560    | 4.90      | 4.76       | 4.72      | 4.68 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3  | 5.00        | 1/1549    | 4.89      | 4.59       | 4.31      | 4.32 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3  | 5.00        | 1/1546    | 4.80      | 4.51       | 4.32      | 4.32 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3  | 5.00        | 1/1323    | 4.70      | 4.39       | 4.00      | 3.91 | 4.70 |
| Discussion                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4          | 1  | 4.20        | 712/1384  | 4.20      | 3.96       | 4.10      | 3.92 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 3  | 4.60        | 525/1378  | 4.60      | 4.21       | 4.29      | 4.09 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 5  | 5.00        | 1/1378    | 5.00      | 4.40       | 4.31      | 4.08 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 6           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 1  | 3.80        | 605/ 904  | 3.80      | 4.02       | 4.03      | 3.94 | 3.80 |
| Laboratory                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 7  | 4.88        | 22/ 232   | 4.88      | 4.60       | 4.19      | 4.25 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 7  | 4.88        | 28/ 239   | 4.88      | 4.70       | 4.21      | 4.35 | 4.88 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 8  | 5.00        | 1/ 230    | 5.00      | 4.88       | 4.44      | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1          | 7  | 4.56        | 104/ 231  | 4.56      | 4.85       | 4.31      | 4.45 | 4.56 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 9  | 5.00        | 1/ 218    | 5.00      | 4.82       | 4.18      | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| Seminar                                                   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2  | 5.00        | ****/ 87  | ****      | ****       | 4.65      | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 5.00        | ****/ 79  | ****      | 4.60       | 4.64      | 4.72 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 1  | 4.00        | ****/ 75  | ****      | ****       | 4.57      | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 9           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0          | 1  | 3.50        | ****/ 79  | ****      | 4.20       | 4.45      | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 1  | 4.00        | ****/ 80  | ****      | 4.20       | 3.97      | 3.99 | **** |
| Field Work                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0  | 4.00        | ****/ 38  | ****      | 4.71       | 4.62      | 4.63 | **** |
| Self Paced                                                |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |             |           |           |            |           |      |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 10          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0          | 0  | 2.00        | ****/ 27  | ****      | 4.40       | 4.54      | 4.46 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors                |                                                               |              |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A 5  | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 0                                                    | Major 0      |
| 28-55          | 2        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B 3  |                       |                                                               |              |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C 1  | General 0             | Under-grad 11                                                 | Non-major 11 |
| 84-150         | 3        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | D 0  |                       |                                                               |              |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 5       | F 0  | Electives 0           | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |              |
|                |          |                 |         | P 0  |                       |                                                               |              |

|   |   |       |   |
|---|---|-------|---|
| I | 0 | Other | 2 |
| ? | 0 |       |   |