

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1392  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1317/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	686/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	329/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	611/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	4	1	7	4	3.69	1046/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1113/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	442/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	323/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	595/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	816/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	454/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	450/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	92/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	661/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	693/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	630/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	263/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	3	0	1	5	6	3.73	180/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	105/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	93/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	4	0	2	5	4	3.33	217/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	57/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1392  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1393  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	0	6	2	2	3.36	1441/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1011/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	922/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1319/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1253/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1084/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	993/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1170/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	665/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1282/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	771/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1173/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	880/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	134/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	154/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	181/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	201/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	121/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1393  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	5	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	0				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1394  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	1377/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	1131/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	840/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	919/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	4	6	3.50	1154/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	5	8	3.74	1056/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	884/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	712/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	830/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	271/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	763/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	195/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	773/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	368/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	653/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	814/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	763/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	269/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	87/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	124/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	93/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	109/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	38/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1394  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1395  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	915/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	929/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	684/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	835/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	7	3	3.67	1059/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	675/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	993/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	682/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	409/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	713/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	338/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	303/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	160/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	607/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	823/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	846/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	728/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	59/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	138/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	68/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	146/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	46/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1396  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1352/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	994/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	958/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1136/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1201/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	6	4	3.47	1213/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	800/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1229/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	301/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	834/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	640/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	930/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	467/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1065/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1060/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	950/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	395/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	146/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	108/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.35
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	65/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	76/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	58/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
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 0201  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1397  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	1	5	3	3	4	3.25	1467/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1261/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1011/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	3	6	3.94	1070/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	8	1	3.50	1154/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1038/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	915/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	903/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1118/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	226/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	588/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	897/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	0	10	4.19	969/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	549/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1098/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	823/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1082/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	643/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	3	2	5	2	3.14	231/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	3.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	180/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	139/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	4	0	4	2	4	3.14	227/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	3	0	9	4.07	118/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	3	0	0	3	3.50	93/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	91/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	3.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	77/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	3.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	39/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	3.86
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	38/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	3.57
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	28/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1397  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1398  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	2	3	4	4	6	3.47	1409/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	951/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	875/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	1193/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	980/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	2	5	7	3.83	969/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	874/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	408/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1044/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1159/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	1233/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1039/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	1046/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	795/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	949/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1001/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	981/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	562/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.77
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	134/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	3	1	3	6	3.92	180/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	160/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.23
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	180/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	97/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1398  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1399  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1199/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	885/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	598/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	871/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	903/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	954/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	397/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	868/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	506/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	798/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	415/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	279/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	233/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.54
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	****
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	125/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	69/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	41/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	154/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	39/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1400  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	1	5	4	5	0	2.87	1522/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	2.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	1	6	5	3.63	1339/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1205/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	3	6	3.81	1171/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	4	2	4	2	2.87	1394/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	6	3	3.50	1199/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	993/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1179/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	872/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	997/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	886/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	5	7	3.93	1133/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	578/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	5	2	0	2.60	1351/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1155/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	943/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	708/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	93/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	58/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	80/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	81/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	42/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1400  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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 0302  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: SHECKELLS, DANI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1401  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	1	5	6	3.75	1297/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	1261/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	541/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	1	4	8	3.88	1129/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	2	3	3	2.88	1392/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	806/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	993/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1229/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	241/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	359/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	225/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	692/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	144/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	586/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	797/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	587/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	210/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	111/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	141/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	189/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	121/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1402  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	5	2	3.24	1470/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	4	6	3.82	1254/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	4	6	3.94	1003/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1331/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	7	4	1	3.13	1328/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1127/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1229/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	712/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1229/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	630/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	1024/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1090/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	1124/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	310/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	937/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	5	0	3.38	1234/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	926/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	194/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	196/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	194/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	150/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	8	4	4.00	166/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	121/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1402  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	4				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1403  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	3	0	1	7	6	3.76	1291/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1254/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	1003/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	907/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1181/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	7	3.76	1028/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1063/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	891/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	9	2	3.79	1110/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	700/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	1080/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	655/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	5	8	4.13	1002/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	534/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	886/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1129/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1218/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	656/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	68/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	86/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	80/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	60/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	57/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	3.50	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	3.60	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	3.60	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	3.86	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 60	3.57	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1403  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	3	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	1				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1404  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	2	5	3.56	1384/1556	3.57	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	817/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	769/1335	4.14	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	847/1510	3.96	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	6	0	6	3.28	1273/1479	3.41	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	3	7	3.94	872/1424	3.77	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	560/1537	4.14	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	9	1	3.79	1110/1536	3.87	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.79
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	211/1487	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	563/1491	4.72	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	338/1489	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	732/1481	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	376/1246	4.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.35
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1170/1411	3.72	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	679/1413	4.01	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	700/1408	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	557/ 856	3.85	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.78
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 244	3.97	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 258	4.24	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 236	4.52	4.50	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 238	4.06	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 214	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1405  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	5	3.58	1377/1556	3.58	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	284/1557	4.68	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	403/1335	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	223/1510	4.74	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	7	3	3.28	1273/1479	3.28	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	10	4	3.78	1019/1424	3.78	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	101/1537	4.89	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	408/1553	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	447/1536	4.44	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	196/1487	4.89	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	798/1491	4.79	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	338/1489	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	719/1481	4.44	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	368/1246	4.37	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	1033/1411	3.58	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	668/1413	4.42	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	451/1408	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	174/ 856	4.64	3.96	4.00	3.87	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	105/ 244	4.22	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	22/ 258	4.89	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	25/ 236	4.94	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	19/ 238	4.94	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	16/ 214	4.94	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.94
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1406  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1255/1556	3.82	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1144/1557	3.94	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	805/1335	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	468/1510	4.47	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	980/1479	3.76	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	772/1424	4.06	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	735/1537	4.29	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	826/1553	4.81	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	600/1536	4.31	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	630/1487	4.65	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1052/1491	4.63	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	598/1489	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	450/1481	4.65	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	360/1246	4.38	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	990/1411	3.67	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	700/1408	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	476/ 856	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	118/ 244	4.14	3.90	4.07	3.82	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	120/ 258	4.29	4.22	4.10	3.94	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	181/ 236	4.00	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	142/ 238	4.29	4.16	4.26	4.00	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	115/ 214	4.21	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.21
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	88/ 102	3.67	4.57	4.50	3.92	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	56/ 101	4.50	4.45	4.39	4.03	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	73/ 90	3.83	4.29	4.36	3.72	3.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	55/ 98	4.50	4.39	4.49	3.93	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	56/ 101	4.00	4.06	4.03	3.92	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	31/ 61	4.56	3.83	3.92	3.19	4.56
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	15/ 60	4.78	4.27	3.86	3.35	4.78
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	20/ 52	4.78	4.54	4.31	4.65	4.78
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	27/ 47	4.11	4.25	4.09	3.67	4.11
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	15/ 44	4.88	4.00	4.09	3.39	4.88
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	23/ 39	4.00	4.23	3.84	4.09	4.00

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	18/	30	4.00	4.35	4.01	4.21	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	10/	16	4.40	4.50	4.36	4.63	4.40
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	12/	16	4.20	4.45	4.51	4.57	4.20

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1406  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						