

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	7	20	12	10	3.28	1573/1644	3.20	3.20	4.32	4.16	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	20	15	11	3.55	1486/1644	3.73	3.73	4.28	4.23	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	13	16	18	3.87	1176/1419	3.84	3.84	4.35	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	6	19	9	12	3.43	1461/1596	3.61	3.61	4.24	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	5	6	16	11	9	3.28	1414/1535	3.18	3.18	4.15	4.02	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	9	4	12	12	12	3.29	1394/1510	3.42	3.42	4.13	3.91	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	9	17	19	3.88	1254/1620	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	39	4.76	899/1642	4.77	4.77	4.68	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	3	5	16	17	5	3.35	1455/1596	3.47	3.47	4.12	4.07	3.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	11	12	30	4.31	1108/1534	4.38	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	14	35	4.52	1289/1539	4.59	4.59	4.76	4.72	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	11	11	28	4.15	1086/1531	4.21	4.21	4.33	4.30	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	1	8	16	22	3.89	1243/1530	3.99	3.99	4.35	4.30	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	5	12	18	14	3.73	1050/1409	3.71	3.71	4.08	3.97	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	6	2	9	5	6	3.11	1269/1366	3.23	3.23	4.18	3.96	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	7	2	6	5	8	3.18	1282/1364	3.39	3.39	4.33	4.10	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	5	2	6	5	10	3.46	1252/1361	3.57	3.57	4.39	4.17	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	25	0	6	3	7	8	5	3.10	957/1019	3.18	3.18	4.09	3.97	3.10

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	2	4	10	10	15	3.78	145/185	3.80	3.80	4.23	4.19	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	2	4	5	4	26	4.17	130/209	4.24	4.24	4.19	4.18	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	1	0	6	2	32	4.56	106/181	4.60	4.60	4.53	4.68	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	2	3	5	4	27	4.24	142/183	4.14	4.14	4.46	4.50	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	5	5	5	4	22	3.80	130/172	3.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.80
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	38	Under-grad	54	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	7	20	12	10	3.28	1573/1644	3.20	3.20	4.32	4.16	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	20	15	11	3.55	1486/1644	3.73	3.73	4.28	4.23	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	13	16	18	3.87	1176/1419	3.84	3.84	4.35	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	6	19	9	12	3.43	1461/1596	3.61	3.61	4.24	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	5	6	16	11	9	3.28	1414/1535	3.18	3.18	4.15	4.02	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	9	4	12	12	12	3.29	1394/1510	3.42	3.42	4.13	3.91	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	9	17	19	3.88	1254/1620	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	39	4.76	899/1642	4.77	4.77	4.68	4.68	4.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	6	2	9	5	6	3.11	1269/1366	3.23	3.23	4.18	3.96	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	7	2	6	5	8	3.18	1282/1364	3.39	3.39	4.33	4.10	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	5	2	6	5	10	3.46	1252/1361	3.57	3.57	4.39	4.17	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	25	0	6	3	7	8	5	3.10	957/1019	3.18	3.18	4.09	3.97	3.10
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	2	4	10	10	15	3.78	145/185	3.80	3.80	4.23	4.19	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	2	4	5	4	26	4.17	130/209	4.24	4.24	4.19	4.18	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	1	0	6	2	32	4.56	106/181	4.60	4.60	4.53	4.68	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	2	3	5	4	27	4.24	142/183	4.14	4.14	4.46	4.50	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	5	5	5	4	22	3.80	130/172	3.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.80
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 100</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 23		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 7	C 8	General 38	Under-grad 54
					Non-major 10

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

84-150	6	3.00-3.49	12	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	0	
				?	7			

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>64</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	7	18	19	16	3.56	1499/1644	3.20	3.20	4.32	4.16	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	21	33	4.30	948/1644	3.73	3.73	4.28	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	23	29	4.17	1005/1419	3.84	3.84	4.35	4.25	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	11	20	28	4.15	1030/1596	3.61	3.61	4.24	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	5	6	13	12	14	3.48	1336/1535	3.18	3.18	4.15	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	5	11	16	23	3.83	1088/1510	3.42	3.42	4.13	3.91	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	9	17	34	4.30	820/1620	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.13	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	8	53	4.87	715/1642	4.77	4.77	4.68	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	12	33	9	3.82	1190/1596	3.47	3.47	4.12	4.07	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	14	48	4.70	611/1534	4.38	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	12	50	4.75	990/1539	4.59	4.59	4.76	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	16	39	4.41	839/1531	4.21	4.21	4.33	4.30	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	21	36	4.40	890/1530	3.99	3.99	4.35	4.30	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	7	1	13	19	20	3.73	1043/1409	3.71	3.71	4.08	3.97	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	3	1	4	6	5	3.47	1160/1366	3.23	3.23	4.18	3.96	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	2	0	7	4	5	3.56	1208/1364	3.39	3.39	4.33	4.10	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1070/1361	3.57	3.57	4.39	4.17	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	46	6	0	1	6	2	3	3.58	****/1019	3.18	3.18	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>64</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	3	3	6	22	21	4.00	123/185	3.80	3.80	4.23	4.19	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	2	6	12	33	4.37	102/209	4.24	4.24	4.19	4.18	4.37
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	4	6	43	4.69	75/181	4.60	4.60	4.53	4.68	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	5	13	35	4.50	94/183	4.14	4.14	4.46	4.50	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	5	6	11	31	4.22	87/172	3.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	4.22
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****



# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 200</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>64</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 32	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 3	General 45	Under-grad 64
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>57</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	7	12	19	14	4	2.93	1622/1644	3.20	3.20	4.32	4.16	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	15	15	3.63	1454/1644	3.73	3.73	4.28	4.23	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	13	10	11	20	3.65	1248/1419	3.84	3.84	4.35	4.25	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	6	20	14	12	3.52	1425/1596	3.61	3.61	4.24	4.09	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	7	8	17	7	6	2.93	1490/1535	3.18	3.18	4.15	4.02	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	4	8	17	10	12	3.35	1365/1510	3.42	3.42	4.13	3.91	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	12	13	24	4.00	1134/1620	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	40	4.72	958/1642	4.77	4.77	4.68	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	6	21	19	0	3.23	1486/1596	3.47	3.47	4.12	4.07	3.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	10	17	24	4.13	1247/1534	4.38	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	6	12	35	4.50	1298/1539	4.59	4.59	4.76	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	13	16	22	4.06	1141/1531	4.21	4.21	4.33	4.30	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	5	7	10	8	22	3.67	1322/1530	3.99	3.99	4.35	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	6	5	7	13	19	3.68	1077/1409	3.71	3.71	4.08	3.97	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	7	2	7	7	8	3.23	1241/1366	3.23	3.23	4.18	3.96	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	4	2	9	6	10	3.52	1218/1364	3.39	3.39	4.33	4.10	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	4	2	8	7	9	3.50	1240/1361	3.57	3.57	4.39	4.17	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	26	3	2	6	9	5	6	3.25	933/1019	3.18	3.18	4.09	3.97	3.25

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>57</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	4	5	6	10	16	3.71	153/185	3.80	3.80	4.23	4.19	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	2	4	14	21	4.24	122/209	4.24	4.24	4.19	4.18	4.24
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	3	8	30	4.60	99/181	4.60	4.60	4.53	4.68	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	4	3	5	11	17	3.85	168/183	4.14	4.14	4.46	4.50	3.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	3	3	6	12	18	3.93	120/172	3.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.93
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	2	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schreier,Susan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>57</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	44	Under-grad	57	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	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				
				?	6						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>57</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	7	12	19	14	4	2.93	1622/1644	3.20	3.20	4.32	4.16	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	15	15	3.63	1454/1644	3.73	3.73	4.28	4.23	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	13	10	11	20	3.65	1248/1419	3.84	3.84	4.35	4.25	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	6	20	14	12	3.52	1425/1596	3.61	3.61	4.24	4.09	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	7	8	17	7	6	2.93	1490/1535	3.18	3.18	4.15	4.02	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	4	8	17	10	12	3.35	1365/1510	3.42	3.42	4.13	3.91	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	12	13	24	4.00	1134/1620	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	40	4.72	958/1642	4.77	4.77	4.68	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1596	3.47	3.47	4.12	4.07	3.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1534	4.38	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	55	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1539	4.59	4.59	4.76	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1531	4.21	4.21	4.33	4.30	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1530	3.99	3.99	4.35	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	3.71	3.71	4.08	3.97	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	7	2	7	7	8	3.23	1241/1366	3.23	3.23	4.18	3.96	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	4	2	9	6	10	3.52	1218/1364	3.39	3.39	4.33	4.10	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	4	2	8	7	9	3.50	1240/1361	3.57	3.57	4.39	4.17	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	26	3	2	6	9	5	6	3.25	933/1019	3.18	3.18	4.09	3.97	3.25

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>57</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	4	5	6	10	16	3.71	153/185	3.80	3.80	4.23	4.19	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	2	4	14	21	4.24	122/209	4.24	4.24	4.19	4.18	4.24
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	3	8	30	4.60	99/181	4.60	4.60	4.53	4.68	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	4	3	5	11	17	3.85	168/183	4.14	4.14	4.46	4.50	3.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	3	3	6	12	18	3.93	120/172	3.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.93
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	2	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SCI 100 300</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Water; Interdis Study</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Braunschweig,Su</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>57</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	44	Under-grad	57	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	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				
				?	6						