

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1408
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	3	2	4	3	3.07	1532/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	1	3.87	1259/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1201/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	3	3.73	1266/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	1	2	4	0	2.55	1446/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	2.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	1	4	4	3.20	1325/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	827/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1260/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	920/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	1168/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1236/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	953/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1173/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1156/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1055/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	728/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	3	0	7	4	3.86	188/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	191/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	149/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	119/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	122/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.36	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1409
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	4	3	3.24	1506/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	4	6	3.71	1330/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	1029/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	1179/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	5	3	3.35	1282/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	8	4.12	963/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	625/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	7	0	3.54	1292/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	846/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	888/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	778/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	1231/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	0	4	5	2	3.21	1116/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	802/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	756/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	644/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	50/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1410
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	2	4	4	3	3.13	1524/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1253/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	3	8	3.88	1080/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	2	4	5	3.67	1300/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	5	2	2	2.67	1439/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	1204/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	5	6	3.75	1239/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1384/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	1160/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	1101/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	951/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	0	4	8	4.14	1035/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	692/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1157/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1030/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	909/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	698/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	207/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	189/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	74/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	132/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	325/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1410
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	7	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	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1411
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1222/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	958/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1048/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1205/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	2	3	1	2	1	2.67	1439/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1039/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	860/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	606/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1103/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	920/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	1240/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	973/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1177/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	4	0	4	5	3.77	882/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	952/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1011/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	997/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	682/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	91/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	115/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1411
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	3				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1412
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1482/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1368/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	5	6	3.80	1110/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1041/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1341/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1063/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	2	9	4.07	999/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	3	0	3	2	3	3.18	1410/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	995/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1125/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	951/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	1118/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	585/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	689/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	841/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	900/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	367/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	99/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	48/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.79	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	29/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	99/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1412
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - 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 2009

Page 1413
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	4	5	3	3.44	1470/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1100/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	972/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	1128/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	5	1	4	3.21	1345/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1142/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1211/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1288/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1192/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	1263/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	1081/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1293/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	889/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	922/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	881/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	913/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	355/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	188/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	198/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	119/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	160/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	99/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	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	1				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1414
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	1	3	8	2	3.29	1500/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	6	8	4.06	1107/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	925/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	7	3.94	1116/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1317/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	11	2	3.76	1087/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	942/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	10	1	3.92	1032/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	920/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	986/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	891/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	696/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	839/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	745/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	845/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	6	6	4.07	913/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	449/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	4.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	176/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	152/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.23	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	185/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	146/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	305/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1414
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0203
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1415
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	5	8	3	3.61	1405/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	698/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	819/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	707/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1242/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	826/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	673/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	712/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	610/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	1053/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	584/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	867/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	268/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	860/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	897/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	719/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	378/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	117/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	71/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	59/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	93/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	67/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.57	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1416
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	4	6	4	3.37	1489/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	5	8	4.00	1138/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	955/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	1315/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1287/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	6	3	3.28	1308/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	827/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	813/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1367/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	1103/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	1296/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	944/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	1065/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	672/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	777/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1192/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1154/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	709/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	1	2	7	5	3.71	199/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	168/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	147/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	135/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	115/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1416
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: BRAUNSCHWEIG, S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1417
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	2	5	3	3	3.06	1532/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	7	3	3.38	1448/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	5	5	3.50	1209/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	1362/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	5	3	2	2.93	1407/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	5	3	3	3.00	1380/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	641/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	972/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	3	5	0	3.33	1367/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	638/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	390/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1054/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1293/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	0	3	3	7	3.69	933/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	4	1	4	3.14	1165/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1099/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1073/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	722/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	1	0	5	8	4.00	157/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	135/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	121/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	135/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	229/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	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	1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	0			

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1418
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	3	2	4	2	3	3.00	1539/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1326/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	7	4	2	3.43	1241/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	1	3	3	4	3.29	1431/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2.92	1413/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1204/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	1285/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	866/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	1345/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	694/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	986/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	792/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	1080/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	780/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1119/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1103/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1036/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	679/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	178/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	148/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	151/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	121/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	186/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1419
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	4	4	3.50	1445/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	3	3.78	1303/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1146/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	6	3.78	1246/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	5	3	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	7	1	3.38	1274/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1159/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	774/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1193/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	929/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1086/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	812/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1176/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1049/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	979/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	698/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	193/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	3.81	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	126/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	107/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	99/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.53	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	155/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1419
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1420
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	2	4	3.24	1506/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	2	9	4.18	1014/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1128/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	1128/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	6	2	2	3.00	1386/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	8	5	1	3.25	1313/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1159/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1285/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1064/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1159/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1003/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1086/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	1	1	4	4	3.21	1116/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1043/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1091/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	900/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	157/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	198/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	197/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.10	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	158/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	105/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1420
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1421
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	3	8	1	2	2.67	1562/1576	3.28	3.34	4.30	4.11	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	4	2	5	3.11	1513/1576	3.86	3.87	4.27	4.18	3.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	2	5	3.44	1233/1342	3.81	3.83	4.32	4.19	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	3	3	3.18	1453/1520	3.76	3.79	4.25	4.09	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1431/1465	3.05	3.11	4.12	4.02	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	2	4	3.06	1370/1434	3.48	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1347/1547	4.02	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	739/1574	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	7	3	0	2.79	1503/1554	3.52	3.55	4.10	4.01	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.42	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1263/1493	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1253/1486	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	8	2	3	3.25	1381/1489	3.95	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	4	7	3	2	3.19	1123/1277	3.78	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.60	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.79	3.80	4.35	4.09	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	1235/1269	3.89	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	3	0	2	1	2.86	831/ 878	3.70	3.74	4.05	3.91	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	117/ 234	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	86/ 240	4.36	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.54	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	110/ 229	4.56	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.62	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	111/ 232	4.45	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	111/ 379	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1421
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1422
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	988/1576	4.22	3.34	4.30	4.11	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	1067/1576	4.11	3.87	4.27	4.18	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	931/1342	4.11	3.83	4.32	4.19	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	985/1520	4.11	3.79	4.25	4.09	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	947/1465	3.94	3.11	4.12	4.02	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1081/1434	3.78	3.50	4.14	3.94	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	708/1547	4.39	4.04	4.19	4.10	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	942/1574	4.65	4.83	4.64	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	924/1554	4.00	3.55	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	966/1493	4.72	4.63	4.73	4.65	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	379/1486	4.72	4.26	4.32	4.26	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	176/1277	4.72	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	869/1279	3.93	3.62	4.17	3.96	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	928/1270	4.00	3.80	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	814/1269	4.27	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	389/ 878	4.21	3.74	4.05	3.91	4.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	86/ 234	4.46	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.46	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	137/ 240	4.31	4.35	4.35	4.29	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	27/ 229	4.92	4.58	4.51	4.43	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	99/ 232	4.54	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.54	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	33/ 379	4.85	4.36	4.20	4.15	4.85	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 2		