

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	5	2	7	2	3.11	1400/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	766/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	5	4.06	943/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	2	4	3	3.07	1285/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	9	4	3.76	991/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	656/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1312/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	727/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1042/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	811/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	905/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	493/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	835/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	1008/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	864/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	3	1	3	4	3.50	655/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	146/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	118/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.35
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	100/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	105/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	52/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	42/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	52/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	4.20
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	43/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	44/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	19/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	4.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	21/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	4.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	18/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	24/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	4.17
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	27/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	22/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	23/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	4.60
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	16/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	4.40
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	25/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	4.40
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	16/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	4.40
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	12/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	4.20

Course-Section: SCI 100 101  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1281  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	1058/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	833/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	1101/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1138/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	812/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	337/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	1060/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	0	11	1	3.60	1188/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	261/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	630/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	341/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	520/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	433/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	773/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	856/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	798/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	637/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	113/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	122/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	85/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	102/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	60/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	58/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	48/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	32/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	12/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	26/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	4.40
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	5.00

Course-Section: SCI 100 101  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1282  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 102  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1283  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	0	2	4	6	3	3	3.06	1406/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	983/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	900/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1036/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	973/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	748/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	459/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	885/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	7	2	3	3.54	1223/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	870/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	1185/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	483/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	887/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	395/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	859/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1100/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	562/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	140/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	143/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	64/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	37/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	37/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: SCI 100 103  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1284  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1027/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	327/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	357/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	425/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	700/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	729/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	265/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	938/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	956/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	626/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	958/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	548/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	877/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	593/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	619/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	767/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	976/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	562/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	79/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	32/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	40/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	57/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	7/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 104  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1285  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	5	6	3	4	3.21	1387/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	8	4	5	3.63	1274/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1074/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	7	3	3.42	1281/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	5	1	4	3.13	1276/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	3	5	5	3.42	1164/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	8	3	7	3.79	1152/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	7	2	1	2.86	1383/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	7	2	6	3.71	1272/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	1286/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	6	4	3.76	1188/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	6	2	5	3.56	1229/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	4	4	3	4	3.18	1057/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	4	0	2.89	1121/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1065/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1107/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	3	0	1	1	2.43	784/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	2.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	146/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	137/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	104/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	101/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	70/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.35

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	16	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	4	3.50	1339/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	3	8	3.72	1239/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	4	7	3.83	1034/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	797/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1231/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	748/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	811/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	803/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	4	7	0	3.31	1300/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	891/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	982/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	953/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1013/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	0	5	7	3.88	775/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1058/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1023/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	745/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	290/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	118/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	72/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	50/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	21/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	8/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****



Course-Section: SCI 100 105  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1286  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	15	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	8	3	3.67	1290/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1105/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	7	3	3.39	1168/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	943/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1319/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	748/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	942/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1238/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	460/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	681/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	829/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	4	7	3.84	1133/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	769/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1076/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	856/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	864/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	127/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	108/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	42/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	12/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	28/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 201  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1287  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1324/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	766/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	717/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	685/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1231/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1075/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	328/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	291/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	849/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	475/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	579/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	353/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	775/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	388/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	925/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	737/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	648/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	423/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	119/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	51/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	17/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	13/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	10/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	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	0
?	0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	2	0	10	4	2	3.22	1385/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	947/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	6	6	3.74	1074/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	745/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1282/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	4	5	3.44	1156/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	906/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	868/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	5	7	0	3.38	1281/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	641/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	1179/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	997/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1010/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	526/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1122/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1043/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	769/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	2	2	10	3	3.53	172/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	3.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	145/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.05
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	78/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	45/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 204  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1289  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	0				
				?	0						

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	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1406/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	6	4	3.44	1339/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	3	6	4	3.53	1137/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	6	5	3.61	1223/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1291/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	3	6	3	3.18	1239/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	866/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	291/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1305/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	2	12	4.33	970/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	829/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	863/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	1074/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	769/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	710/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	1005/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	1	0	1	5	3.67	1013/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	195/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	4	0	4	6	5	3.42	178/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	3.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	3	4	6	5	3.58	176/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	3.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	2	1	15	4.53	100/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	141/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	83/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.26
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	62/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	3.20
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	61/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	2.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	61/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	3.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	55/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	3.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	32/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****



Course-Section: SCI 100 205  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Braunschweig,Su  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1290  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	5	5	3.44	1352/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	983/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	798/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	745/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	4	3	4	3	3.13	1278/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	8	3.83	950/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	10	3	3.88	1003/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	230/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	707/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	496/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1030/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	602/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1050/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	691/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	710/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	581/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	137/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	89/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	32/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	102/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	19/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	28/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	14/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.47
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	14/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	4.87
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	2	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	25/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	3.81
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	8	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	19/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	4.40
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 301  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1291  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	15	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	8	6	2	3.37	1365/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	792/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	9	7	4.05	900/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	4	4.00	976/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	5	4	2	3.20	1262/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	870/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	500/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1131/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	460/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	889/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	539/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	831/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	395/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	710/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	832/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	941/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	318/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	105/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	54/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	17/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	65/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	10/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.85
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 302  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1292  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	4	6	5	3.72	1269/1447	3.46	3.46	4.31	4.18	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	532/1447	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	496/1241	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	854/1402	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.15	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	1	2	9	3.88	938/1358	3.35	3.35	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	812/1316	3.82	3.82	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	1	13	4.39	620/1427	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	1	0	14	4.47	1101/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	812/1434	3.56	3.56	4.10	4.10	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	536/1387	4.56	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	1143/1387	4.65	4.65	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	663/1386	4.41	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	0	11	4.19	946/1380	4.13	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	861/1193	4.05	4.05	4.02	3.99	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	521/1172	3.63	3.63	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	691/1182	3.93	3.93	4.35	4.18	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	648/1170	3.95	3.95	4.38	4.17	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	308/ 800	3.76	3.76	4.06	3.95	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	133/ 189	4.08	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	102/ 192	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	104/ 186	4.70	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 187	4.62	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	34/ 168	4.63	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 66	3.93	3.93	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 62	3.80	3.80	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 58	4.48	4.47	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 65	3.90	3.90	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 64	4.27	4.27	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 38	4.25	4.25	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 36	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 28	4.68	4.68	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 30	4.10	4.10	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	4.47	4.47	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 21	4.70	4.70	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 20	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 15	4.60	4.60	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 304  
 Title Water; Interdis Study  
 Instructor: Readell, Karin E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1293  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						