

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1302
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	780/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	661/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	451/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	416/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	8	3.85	839/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	10	7	4.00	755/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	611/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	771/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	261/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	300/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	289/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	591/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	372/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	2	2	10	4.12	666/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	588/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	760/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	300/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	89/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	111/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.35	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	52/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	83/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.65	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	57/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1303
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	478/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	422/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	357/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	620/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	707/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	683/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	695/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	863/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	722/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	376/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	480/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	129/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	570/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	588/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	209/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	66/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	53/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	50/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	71/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	49/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1304
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	652/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	246/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	261/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	364/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	4	2	2	6	3.71	950/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	683/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	332/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	9	1	3.69	1146/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	404/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	511/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	248/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	53/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	56/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	24/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	13/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1304
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	7	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1305
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1206/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	801/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	679/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	840/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1136/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	701/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	367/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	417/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	823/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	116/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	591/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	192/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	645/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	895/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	658/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	347/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	220/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	106/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.25	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1305
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1306
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	870/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	603/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	432/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	784/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	613/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	5	12	4.19	592/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	378/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	756/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	751/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	334/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	804/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	311/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	480/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	152/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	274/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	470/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	117/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	116/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	76/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	69/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.72	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	47/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	61/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1306
 JUN 13, 2006
 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 8	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1307
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	1187/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	481/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	548/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	485/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1278/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1071/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	766/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	836/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	865/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	445/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	561/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	590/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	659/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	489/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	357/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	347/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	144/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	111/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	32/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	89/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	55/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1307
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1308
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	8	4	3.56	1341/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	801/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	726/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	1101/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	6	4	3.44	1114/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	934/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	961/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	797/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	836/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	762/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	880/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	513/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	937/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	503/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	570/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	489/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	278/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	151/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	114/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	140/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	131/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	79/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.42	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1308
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	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 0204
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1309
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	3	4	3.63	1315/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	822/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	742/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	885/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	1	4	3.38	1145/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	719/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	1078/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	951/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	973/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	275/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	614/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	234/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	444/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	152/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	855/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	480/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	815/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	166/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	202/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	170/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	3.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	175/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	199/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	94/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1309
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1310
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	1006/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	560/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	655/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	784/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	6	3	3	3.19	1228/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	7	6	4.00	755/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	766/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	692/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	202/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	522/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	417/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	591/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	248/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	477/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	486/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	114/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	104/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	61/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	47/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	62/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	55/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.62	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1311
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	1	4	7	4.07	1024/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	349/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	663/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	959/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	942/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	948/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	671/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	784/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	504/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	400/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	1019/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	534/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	421/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	404/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	895/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	680/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1312
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	957/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	324/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	470/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	582/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	918/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.00	755/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	242/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1030/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	383/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	963/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	245/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	541/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	177/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	570/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	588/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	698/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	152/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	37/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	59/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	36/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1312
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1313
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	957/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	324/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	470/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	582/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	918/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.00	755/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	242/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	570/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	588/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	698/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	152/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	37/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	59/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	36/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1313
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1314
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	769/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	374/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	261/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	302/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	5	3	4	3.53	1065/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	948/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	119/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	491/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	651/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	334/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	350/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	212/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	336/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	208/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	680/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	87/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	31/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	40/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	71/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	31/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1315
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1024/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	399/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	498/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	326/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	985/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	713/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	460/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	912/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	546/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	150/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	861/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	311/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	187/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	708/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	783/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	773/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	278/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	37/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	24/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 17	Non-major 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100 0305
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1316
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	2	0	3	8	3	3.63	1315/1481	4.06	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	374/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	647/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	406/1424	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	782/1396	3.64	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	230/1342	4.02	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	460/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	491/1480	4.87	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	1014/1450	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	231/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	162/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	397/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	97/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	797/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	643/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	636/1256	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	347/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	116/ 246	4.42	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 249	4.56	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 242	4.70	4.45	4.40	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	47/ 240	4.66	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 217	4.65	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1317
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1134/1481	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	811/1481	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	2	9	4.07	869/1249	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	950/1396	3.71	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1101/1342	3.53	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1089/1450	3.77	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	533/1179	4.13	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	862/1262	3.80	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 246	4.36	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	89/ 249	4.45	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	128/ 242	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.45	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	71/ 240	4.73	4.37	4.20	4.20	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	62/ 217	4.55	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1317
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						