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**General Notes**

*C. virina* sp., Troglophilie (?). Independence Co.: Dodd Cave. A juvenile was removed from the anterior chamber of this cave. The genus includes several cave species.

*Meta menardi* (Latreille), Troglophilie, Izard Co.: Needles Cave. The cave orb weaver is found in caves, mines, and similar habitats throughout the eastern U.S.

*Clitopus n.* sp., Troglophilie. Stone Co.: Roasting Ear Cave. Ctenids are foraging spiders, and one specimen was found in the dry front chamber of this cave.

*Meta menardi* sp., Troglophilie. Independence Co.: Dodd Cave. Collected from a dry guano pile near the center of the cave.

*Porrothoma cavernicolum* Keyserling, Troglophilie. barely Co.: Davis Pit. A widespread cave inhabitant.

*Lycosa sp.* var. versicolor versicolor Ctenus n sp.; Opiliones; Meta menardi arachnids; G. pallida Palpura. This specimen was collected from the southern part of the United States.

Class Diplopoda

Order Chordeumida

Family Conotylidae

*Trichopeltella* sp., Troglophilie. Scarry Co.: Davis Pit. *T. uncum* was previously reported from Sharp Co. (McDaniel and Smith, 1979).

Class Insecta

Order Diprura

Family Campodeidae

*Phyllocompa* n. sp., Troglophilie. Fulton Co.: Richardson Cave; Izard Co.: Clay Cave; Stone Co.: Hell Creek Cave. Roasting Ear Cave, Roland Cave. Although a very common cave inhabitant, diplurans are taxonomically very poorly known.

Order Diptera

Family Helomyzidae

*Ameobaeria defesa* (Osten Sacken), Troglophilie. Independence Co.: Cushman Cave; Stone Co.: Roasting Ear Cave. All specimens of this common cave inhabitant were found in the front chamber of caves.

*Ancothea specus* (Aldrich), Troglophilie. Izard Co.: Clay Cave. Found only in the front chamber of the cave.

*Helomyza brachyptera* Loew. Troglophilie. Sharp Co.: Center Cave. Another of the flies that overwinters in Arkansas caves.

PHYLUM CHORDATA

Class Amphibia

Order Anura

Family Hylidae

*Hylo versicolor versicolor* LeConte, Accidental. Stone Co.: Hell Creek Cave. A single specimen of this frog was found at the bottom of a shaft into the cave.

Assistant in collecting specimens is gratefully acknowledged from S. Clark, G. Gardner, T. Gardner, D. Saugey, and K. Sutton. We especially appreciate and acknowledge the contributions of each of the following systematists in identification of specimens: T. C. Barr, carabids; N. B. Causey, millipedes; J. C. Coker, arachnids; W. R. Elliot, arachnids and records for Davis Pit; W. R. Gertsch, araneids; C. J. Goodnight, opilionids; J. R. Holsinger, amphipods; J. M. Kingsolver, isopods; L. Knutson, insects; W. M. Muchmore, pseudoscorpions; J. R. Reddell, arachnids; G. Steyskal, helomyzids.
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**LICHENS OF ARKANSAS I: A SUMMARY OF CURRENT INFORMATION**

The earliest publications on lichens in this country included only a few references to these plants from Arkansas. The earliest of these, written by the "Father of American Lichenology," Edward Tuckerman (1882), listed three species from Arkansas which were collected by Dr. Peters. Much later, Bruce Fink (1935) listed a total of five species from the state, including those mentioned by Tuckerman. Edward C. Berry (1941) listed 18 specimens from Arkansas in his monograph of the genus Parmelia. This included two new species of Parmelia which he had collected about 11 miles south of Harrison in Newton County. The type specimen for Parmelia erecta Berry was placed in the Missouri Botanical Garden herbarium.
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EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE COURSES BY BIOLOGY TEACHERS

Eighteen high school science teachers who brought students to a High School Science Day at the University of Central Arkansas were asked to complete questionnaires about the size and organization of their schools, some aspects of their lives as teachers, and their evaluation of selected college courses as far as the usefulness of these courses to a high school science teacher. The questionnaire required only the checking of appropriate blanks.

Of the eighteen teachers who were polled, fourteen were biology majors in college, two were mathematics majors, one was a physical education major, and one was a business administration major. Each of the participants was teaching one or more science courses in high school. The teaching experience of the respondents ranged from one year to twenty years with a mean of 5.2 years. Twenty-eight percent of the teachers taught only biology, and 72% taught biology and another science. Seventy-two percent indicated that they had free periods during the school day that could be used for the preparation of lessons and teaching materials.

The smallest school represented in the survey had 115 students, and the largest had 500. Twelve percent of the schools included grades 10-12, 25 percent had grades 9-12, 25 percent had grades 9-12, and 38 percent were grades 7-12. Table 1 summarizes other information about the schools.

Table 2 indicates the number of teachers who had taken each of the selected courses in college, the percent who had taken each course, and their evaluations of the courses.

It should be noted that only small schools are represented in the study. The pupil-teacher ratio for either biology teachers or for science teachers in general is not high.

Explaining the course evaluations is difficult. Why should General Zoology be given a perfect 1.00 rating and both General Botany and General Biology receive lower ratings? The differences in evaluations cannot be ascribed to large differences in the number of teachers who evaluated the courses because in each case a large majority of the teachers who were polled evaluated each course. The higher rating of zoology compared with botany might be caused by a greater interest in animals than in plants. If this is true, however, how can the fact that botany rated higher than General Biology be explained?

It should be noted that, except for Conservation, the biology courses that rated 1.00 are some aspect of zoology or human biology. Applied Physics, which has a life science emphasis, was rated higher than General Physics. This may be a result of the small number of respondents who had taken the course, or it may indicate the natural antipathy of many biology majors for anything that requires a rigorous mathematical treatment.

Although this study is too small for any of the results to be statistically significant, some of the results are interesting. The ratings of various college courses may indicate a need for continuing education courses required of biology teachers.

Table 1. Some characteristics of schools included in study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Organization (Grades)</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>8-12</th>
<th>7-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120-275</td>
<td>280-300</td>
<td>115-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of science teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/science teacher</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of biology teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/biology teacher</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers did not supply information requested.