

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0101
 Title GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 906
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	6	20	15	4.17	1056/1674	3.93	4.30	4.27	4.07	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	13	21	4.24	956/1674	3.94	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	9	24	4.32	792/1423	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.16	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	30	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1211/1609	3.70	4.16	4.22	4.05	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	7	17	15	4.05	742/1585	3.83	3.86	3.96	3.88	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	36	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1535	****	4.14	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	7	33	4.69	298/1651	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	26	12	4.22	1449/1673	4.49	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	10	23	3	3.81	1200/1656	3.71	4.05	4.07	3.96	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	4.74	538/1586	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	9	31	4.64	1094/1585	4.69	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	30	4.67	438/1582	4.29	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	11	25	4.45	755/1575	4.17	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	11	22	4.37	406/1380	4.10	4.13	3.94	3.78	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	5	3	6	11	3.52	1165/1520	3.64	3.66	4.01	3.76	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	7	9	4	6	3.10	1414/1515	3.80	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	5	3	5	11	3.41	1330/1511	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.00	3.41
4. Were special techniques successful	13	25	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 994	3.35	3.89	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	42	Non-major	42
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	7	24	27	4.34	841/1674	3.93	4.30	4.27	4.07	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	2	3	25	28	4.31	870/1674	3.94	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	8	14	36	4.48	599/1423	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.16	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	37	1	0	7	5	8	3.90	1224/1609	3.70	4.16	4.22	4.05	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	5	2	4	13	18	15	3.77	1040/1585	3.83	3.86	3.96	3.88	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	45	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	****/1535	****	4.14	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	4	15	37	4.54	471/1651	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	37	20	4.35	1347/1673	4.49	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	4	25	19	4.31	641/1656	3.71	4.05	4.07	3.96	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	14	45	4.76	474/1586	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	56	4.95	340/1585	4.69	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	24	31	4.48	661/1582	4.29	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	16	40	4.66	509/1575	4.17	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	8	20	29	4.37	406/1380	4.10	4.13	3.94	3.78	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	2	6	10	21	4.20	700/1520	3.64	3.66	4.01	3.76	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	1	8	30	4.59	560/1515	3.80	3.97	4.24	3.97	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	3	10	28	4.55	610/1511	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.00	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	26	2	4	4	0	7	3.35	803/ 994	3.35	3.89	3.94	3.73	3.35	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0201
 Title GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI
 Instructor: JEFFREY, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 115
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 907
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	16	Under-grad	64	Non-major	63
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	8	4	25	24	7	3.26	1581/1674	3.93	4.30	4.27	4.07	3.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	25	19	10	3.28	1572/1674	3.94	4.20	4.23	4.16	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	12	17	20	9	3.12	1352/1423	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.16	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	37	3	5	9	7	6	3.27	1515/1609	3.70	4.16	4.22	4.05	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	5	14	17	24	3.69	1107/1585	3.83	3.86	3.96	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	51	3	1	5	2	3	3.07	****/1535	****	4.14	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	14	16	30	4.03	1077/1651	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	3	61	4.89	724/1673	4.49	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	6	4	32	10	3	3.00	1540/1656	3.71	4.05	4.07	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	1	10	15	35	4.12	1237/1586	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	6	11	46	4.48	1241/1585	4.69	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	5	15	22	19	3.72	1320/1582	4.29	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	10	17	16	16	3.40	1402/1575	4.17	4.31	4.27	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	6	7	11	17	18	3.58	1009/1380	4.10	4.13	3.94	3.78	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	9	5	17	9	12	3.19	1306/1520	3.64	3.66	4.01	3.76	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	5	6	9	11	21	3.71	1233/1515	3.80	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	1	8	15	24	4.04	1040/1511	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.00	4.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	37	5	3	3	0	4	2.67	****/ 994	3.35	3.89	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	2	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0301
 Title GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 908
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	5	A	9	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	21	General	5	Under-grad	68	Non-major	67
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	12	7	22	6	9	2.88	1644/1674	3.55	4.30	4.27	4.07	2.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	13	10	9	14	10	2.96	1618/1674	3.66	4.20	4.23	4.16	2.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	12	6	11	11	16	3.23	1336/1423	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.16	3.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	31	10	2	5	3	4	2.54	1601/1609	2.54	4.16	4.22	4.05	2.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	5	7	17	11	7	3.17	1396/1585	3.52	3.86	3.96	3.88	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	43	3	0	5	1	0	2.44	****/1535	****	4.14	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	4	9	10	25	3.92	1201/1651	4.34	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	1	0	3	40	5	3.98	1583/1673	4.49	4.56	4.69	4.67	3.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	10	6	15	9	1	2.63	1613/1656	3.36	4.05	4.07	3.96	2.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	5	9	10	24	3.81	1397/1586	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.37	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	9	7	9	8	20	3.43	1556/1585	4.18	4.79	4.69	4.60	3.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	9	10	18	12	4	2.85	1537/1582	3.72	4.24	4.26	4.17	2.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	3	11	5	16	12	6	2.94	1505/1575	3.79	4.31	4.27	4.17	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	7	4	11	12	15	3.49	1047/1380	4.03	4.13	3.94	3.78	3.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	17	5	2	2	2	1.82	1511/1520	2.54	3.66	4.01	3.76	1.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	14	6	7	1	1	1.93	1497/1515	2.94	3.97	4.24	3.97	1.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	11	7	5	4	2	2.28	1489/1511	3.00	4.06	4.27	4.00	2.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	23	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	8
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	15
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1

			Required for Majors	29	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	4	56
			Other	14	Non-major
					Major
					55
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	18	24	4.22	991/1674	3.55	4.30	4.27	4.07	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	15	27	4.35	816/1674	3.66	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	13	32	4.55	517/1423	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.16	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	40	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/1609	2.54	4.16	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	3	5	10	23	3.87	936/1585	3.52	3.86	3.96	3.88	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	47	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1535	****	4.14	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	42	4.76	231/1651	4.34	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	48	5.00	1/1673	4.49	4.56	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	4	22	11	4.08	912/1656	3.36	4.05	4.07	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	42	4.89	231/1586	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	43	4.93	397/1585	4.18	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	12	32	4.60	535/1582	3.72	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	9	34	4.64	537/1575	3.79	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	11	31	4.57	265/1380	4.03	4.13	3.94	3.78	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	2	11	12	3	3.25	1284/1520	2.54	3.66	4.01	3.76	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	3	4	14	11	3.94	1103/1515	2.94	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	3	7	7	13	3.73	1238/1511	3.00	4.06	4.27	4.00	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	29	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 110 0201
 Title GEOG OF ENV SYSTEMS
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO
 Enrollment: 105
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 910
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	49	Non-major	47
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	5	12	14	4.19	1036/1674	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.07	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	392/1674	4.66	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	470/1423	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.16	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	****/1609	****	4.16	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	283/1585	4.57	3.86	3.96	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1535	****	4.14	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	8	22	4.56	445/1651	4.56	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	832/1673	4.84	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	16	8	4.11	894/1656	4.11	4.05	4.07	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	633/1586	4.69	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	423/1582	4.68	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	523/1575	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	3	25	4.65	213/1380	4.65	4.13	3.94	3.78	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	7	10	7	3.88	936/1520	3.88	3.66	4.01	3.76	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	7	6	10	3.88	1145/1515	3.88	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	663/1511	4.48	4.06	4.27	4.00	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	21	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

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

Course-Section: GEOG 120 0101
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 912
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	8	11	10	4.07	1147/1674	4.07	4.30	4.27	4.07	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	13	8	3.97	1196/1674	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.16	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	10	10	9	3.97	1052/1423	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.16	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	2	2	7	6	3.68	1366/1609	3.68	4.16	4.22	4.05	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	8	13	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.86	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	3	4	5	1	3	2.81	1485/1535	2.81	4.14	4.08	3.89	2.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	11	16	4.41	658/1651	4.41	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	724/1673	4.89	4.56	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	8	13	3	3.79	1207/1656	3.79	4.05	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	231/1586	4.90	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	748/1582	4.43	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	6	17	4.36	867/1575	4.36	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	5	9	13	4.07	639/1380	4.07	4.13	3.94	3.78	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	10	5	4	3.36	1239/1520	3.36	3.66	4.01	3.76	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	2	8	9	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.97	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	4	4	13	4.32	835/1511	4.32	4.06	4.27	4.00	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	3	4	3	4	4	3.11	871/ 994	3.11	3.89	3.94	3.73	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 120 0101
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 912
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	30	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 206 0101
 Title ECOLOGY
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 913
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	817/1674	4.37	4.30	4.27	4.32	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	919/1674	4.26	4.20	4.23	4.26	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	836/1423	4.26	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	799/1609	4.29	4.16	4.22	4.23	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	548/1585	4.26	3.86	3.96	3.91	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	7	5	3.68	1196/1535	3.68	4.14	4.08	4.03	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	432/1651	4.58	4.34	4.18	4.20	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	3	13	1	3.78	1638/1673	3.78	4.56	4.69	4.67	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	1392/1585	4.26	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	924/1582	4.26	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	14	4.47	730/1575	4.47	4.31	4.27	4.39	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	810/1380	3.89	4.13	3.94	4.03	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.71	3.66	4.01	4.03	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1158/1515	3.86	3.97	4.24	4.28	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1243/1511	3.71	4.06	4.27	4.28	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: GEOG 220 0101
 Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 914
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	233/1674	4.81	4.30	4.27	4.32	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.20	4.23	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	141/1609	4.87	4.16	4.22	4.23	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.86	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.14	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.34	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.94	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	200/1656	4.73	4.05	4.07	4.10	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	236/1582	4.81	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.13	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	274/1520	4.69	3.66	4.01	4.03	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1515	5.00	3.97	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	312/1511	4.85	4.06	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	89/ 994	4.83	3.89	3.94	3.98	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	21/ 265	4.93	4.71	4.23	4.34	4.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	76/ 278	4.57	4.62	4.19	4.36	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.91	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	36/ 233	4.79	4.77	4.20	4.48	4.79	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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 15		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.30	4.27	4.32	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1035/1674	4.15	4.20	4.23	4.26	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	803/1423	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	879/1609	4.23	4.16	4.22	4.23	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	4	1	3.08	1428/1585	3.08	3.86	3.96	3.91	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	2	1	2.92	1466/1535	2.92	4.14	4.08	4.03	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1317/1651	3.77	4.34	4.18	4.20	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	900/1656	4.09	4.05	4.07	4.10	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1034/1582	4.15	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	975/1575	4.23	4.31	4.27	4.39	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	576/1380	4.15	4.13	3.94	4.03	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	967/1520	3.83	3.66	4.01	4.03	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	960/1515	4.17	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.06	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	146/ 265	4.25	4.71	4.23	4.34	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	86/ 278	4.50	4.62	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	124/ 260	4.57	4.91	4.46	4.51	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	115/ 259	4.50	4.93	4.33	4.42	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.67	4.77	4.20	4.48	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 280 0101
 Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 915
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 305 0101
 Title LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 916
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	2	3.88	1340/1674	3.88	4.30	4.27	4.26	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	1	3.69	1411/1674	3.69	4.20	4.23	4.21	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1079/1423	3.94	4.31	4.27	4.27	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	5	2	3.06	1429/1585	3.06	3.86	3.96	3.95	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	4	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.14	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	713/1651	4.38	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.94	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	7	3	2	3.46	1394/1656	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.07	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	1266/1582	3.81	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.31	4.27	4.25	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	413/1380	4.36	4.13	3.94	4.01	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1129/1520	3.60	3.66	4.01	4.09	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	759/1515	4.40	3.97	4.24	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.06	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	3.89	3.94	3.96	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	11	19	4.31	891/1674	4.31	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	7	18	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	6	25	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	3	9	14	4.21	905/1609	4.21	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	4	5	4	9	3.82	996/1585	3.82	3.86	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	3	3	6	10	4.05	853/1535	4.05	4.14	4.08	4.15	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	10	18	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	9	22	4.56	1169/1673	4.56	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	3	6	13	8	3.87	1154/1656	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.07	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	7	12	14	4.03	1119/1582	4.03	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	3	10	18	4.14	1070/1575	4.14	4.31	4.27	4.25	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	6	4	9	6	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	4.13	3.94	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	5	5	6	3.63	1110/1520	3.63	3.66	4.01	4.09	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	6	5	6	3.74	1221/1515	3.74	3.97	4.24	4.32	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	5	6	6	3.84	1172/1511	3.84	4.06	4.27	4.34	3.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 311 0101
 Title WEATHER AND CLIMATE
 Instructor: TOKAY, ALI
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 917
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	36	Non-major	22
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GEOG 313 0101
 Title BIOGEOGRAPHY
 Instructor: KIRKHAM, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 918
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	10	4	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.30	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	3	3.13	1596/1674	3.13	4.20	4.23	4.21	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	8	8	3.79	1158/1423	3.79	4.31	4.27	4.27	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	6	3	7	6	3.48	1461/1609	3.48	4.16	4.22	4.27	3.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	11	4	3	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.86	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	4	6	5	4	3.04	1432/1535	3.04	4.14	4.08	4.15	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	7	8	3.71	1360/1651	3.71	4.34	4.18	4.16	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	19	1	3.88	1627/1673	3.88	4.56	4.69	4.68	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	10	3	1	3.06	1533/1656	3.06	4.05	4.07	4.07	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	8	8	6	3.71	1333/1582	3.71	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	3	7	8	3.67	1329/1575	3.67	4.31	4.27	4.25	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	887/1380	3.77	4.13	3.94	4.01	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/1520	****	3.66	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1511	****	4.06	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	24
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: GEOG 326 0101
 Title CONSERVATION THOUGHT
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 919
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	20	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	15	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	583/1609	4.45	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	360/1585	4.47	3.86	3.96	3.95	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	8	14	4.24	679/1535	4.24	4.14	4.08	4.15	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	795/1651	4.31	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	7	4.23	1434/1673	4.23	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	2	11	12	4.27	706/1656	4.27	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	774/1586	4.59	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	9	14	4.24	946/1582	4.24	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	601/1575	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.25	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	6	11	7	3.85	838/1380	3.85	4.13	3.94	4.01	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	790/1520	4.06	3.66	4.01	4.09	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	0	13	4.63	523/1515	4.63	3.97	4.24	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	346/1511	4.81	4.06	4.27	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	8	2	3	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.89	3.94	3.96	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 15		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General 9	Under-grad 30 Non-major 20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GEOG 350 0101
 Title SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 920
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	703/1674	4.45	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	519/1674	4.55	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	390/1423	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	536/1609	4.47	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	3	7	3.74	1066/1585	3.74	3.86	3.96	3.95	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	7	12	4.45	613/1651	4.45	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1040/1673	4.70	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	366/1656	4.53	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	340/1585	4.95	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	394/1582	4.70	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	179/1380	4.70	4.13	3.94	4.01	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	901/1520	3.92	3.66	4.01	4.09	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1002/1515	4.08	3.97	4.24	4.32	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	917/1511	4.23	4.06	4.27	4.34	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	178/ 265	4.00	4.71	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: GEOG 381 0101
 Title REMOTE SENSING
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 921
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	891/1674	4.30	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.16	4.22	4.27	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1528/1585	2.70	3.86	3.96	3.95	2.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.14	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1240/1651	3.89	4.34	4.18	4.16	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1431/1656	3.38	4.05	4.07	4.07	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	945/1586	4.44	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1290/1582	3.78	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	983/1575	4.22	4.31	4.27	4.25	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	612/1380	4.11	4.13	3.94	4.01	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1210/1520	3.43	3.66	4.01	4.09	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1233/1515	3.71	3.97	4.24	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1328/1511	3.43	4.06	4.27	4.34	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	958/ 994	2.60	3.89	3.94	3.96	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 381 0101
 Title REMOTE SENSING
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 921
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 386 0101
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 922
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	854/1674	4.17	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1146/1674	3.90	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	648/1423	4.12	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	687/1609	4.19	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	976/1585	3.14	3.86	3.96	3.95	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	578/1535	3.75	4.14	4.08	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	832/1651	3.98	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1397/1673	4.31	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1177/1656	3.62	4.05	4.07	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	858/1586	4.47	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1585	4.65	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1302/1582	3.65	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1230/1575	3.77	4.31	4.27	4.25	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	603/1380	3.90	4.13	3.94	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1520	1.33	3.66	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	1.00	3.97	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1511	1.33	4.06	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	4.67	4.71	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	4.67	4.62	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	5.00	4.91	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: GEOG 386 0102
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 923
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1196/1674	4.17	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1340/1674	3.90	4.20	4.23	4.21	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1155/1423	4.12	4.31	4.27	4.27	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.19	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	2	1	1	2.44	1549/1585	3.14	3.86	3.96	3.95	2.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1414/1535	3.75	4.14	4.08	4.15	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1377/1651	3.98	4.34	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1361/1673	4.31	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1421/1656	3.62	4.05	4.07	4.07	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	945/1586	4.47	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1183/1585	4.65	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1388/1582	3.65	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	0	4	3.67	1329/1575	3.77	4.31	4.27	4.25	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	962/1380	3.90	4.13	3.94	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1514/1520	1.33	3.66	4.01	4.09	1.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1513/1515	1.00	3.97	4.24	4.32	1.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1510/1511	1.33	4.06	4.27	4.34	1.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 265	4.67	4.71	4.23	4.26	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	57/ 278	4.67	4.62	4.19	4.24	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.91	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.33	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	1	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 400A 0101
 Title GEOGRAPHY OF POPULATIO
 Instructor: RATCLIFFE, MICH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 924
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.30	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.20	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	195/1423	4.82	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	443/1609	4.55	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	708/1585	4.09	3.86	3.96	4.01	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	337/1535	4.55	4.14	4.08	4.18	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1257/1673	4.45	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1656	4.44	4.05	4.07	4.19	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	816/1586	4.55	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	537/1575	4.64	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	514/1380	4.22	4.13	3.94	4.04	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.78	3.66	4.01	4.18	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	827/1515	4.33	3.97	4.24	4.40	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	602/1511	4.56	4.06	4.27	4.45	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	3.89	3.94	4.19	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.58	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.83	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.79	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 400A 0101
 Title GEOGRAPHY OF POPULATIO
 Instructor: RATCLIFFE, MICH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 924
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 406 0101
 Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 925
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.30	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	495/1674	4.57	4.20	4.23	4.31	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1423	4.64	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	333/1609	4.64	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1585	4.64	3.86	3.96	4.01	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1535	4.79	4.14	4.08	4.18	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1651	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1537/1673	4.07	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	257/1656	4.75	4.05	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1575	4.92	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	79/1380	4.91	4.13	3.94	4.04	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1520	4.29	3.66	4.01	4.18	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.83	3.97	4.24	4.40	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.06	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.89	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	27/ 265	4.91	4.71	4.23	4.53	4.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	64/ 278	4.64	4.62	4.19	4.21	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	41/ 260	4.91	4.91	4.46	4.24	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.31	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	25/ 233	4.91	4.77	4.20	4.10	4.91	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	19/ 76	4.89	4.86	3.98	4.86	4.89	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	17/ 77	4.88	4.58	3.93	4.24	4.88	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	19/ 53	4.88	4.83	4.45	4.86	4.88	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	16/ 48	4.57	4.60	4.12	4.13	4.57	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	20/ 49	4.86	4.79	4.27	4.48	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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 12		
				? 2			

Course-Section: GEOG 406 0101
 Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 926
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.30	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	495/1674	4.57	4.20	4.23	4.31	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1423	4.64	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	333/1609	4.64	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1585	4.64	3.86	3.96	4.01	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1535	4.79	4.14	4.08	4.18	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1651	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1537/1673	4.07	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.75	4.05	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1586	4.69	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1582	4.54	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1575	4.92	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	4.91	4.13	3.94	4.04	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1520	4.29	3.66	4.01	4.18	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.83	3.97	4.24	4.40	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.06	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.89	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	27/ 265	4.91	4.71	4.23	4.53	4.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	64/ 278	4.64	4.62	4.19	4.21	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	41/ 260	4.91	4.91	4.46	4.24	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.31	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	25/ 233	4.91	4.77	4.20	4.10	4.91	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	19/ 76	4.89	4.86	3.98	4.86	4.89	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	17/ 77	4.88	4.58	3.93	4.24	4.88	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	19/ 53	4.88	4.83	4.45	4.86	4.88	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	16/ 48	4.57	4.60	4.12	4.13	4.57	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	20/ 49	4.86	4.79	4.27	4.48	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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 12		
				? 2			

Course-Section: GEOG 411 0101
 Title FLUVIAL MORPHOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 927
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.30	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.20	4.23	4.31	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	4.22	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.86	3.96	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.14	4.08	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1360/1651	3.70	4.34	4.18	4.23	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1104/1586	4.30	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.13	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	****	3.66	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1511	****	4.06	4.27	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 76	4.80	4.86	3.98	4.86	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	37/ 77	4.00	4.58	3.93	4.24	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	22/ 53	4.75	4.83	4.45	4.86	4.75	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	13/ 48	4.67	4.60	4.12	4.13	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 49	4.67	4.79	4.27	4.48	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GEOG 451 0101
 Title CITY AND GLOBALIZATION
 Instructor: SHORT, JOHN R
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 928
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.30	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.20	4.23	4.31	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.83	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.86	3.96	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.14	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.35	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	4.67	3.66	4.01	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	3.97	4.24	4.40	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.06	4.27	4.45	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.89	3.94	4.19	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 481 0101
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 929
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1139/1674	4.08	4.30	4.27	4.42	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	956/1674	4.23	4.20	4.23	4.31	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	879/1609	4.23	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1289/1585	3.42	3.86	3.96	4.01	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	508/1535	4.40	4.14	4.08	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	1459/1651	3.46	4.34	4.18	4.23	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	814/1673	4.85	4.56	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	805/1656	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.19	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	826/1586	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1130/1585	4.62	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1089/1582	4.08	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1050/1575	4.15	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	447/1380	4.31	4.13	3.94	4.04	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1200/1520	3.44	3.66	4.01	4.18	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	987/1515	4.11	3.97	4.24	4.40	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.22	4.06	4.27	4.45	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.89	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 265	****	4.71	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 278	****	4.62	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 260	****	4.91	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 259	****	4.93	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.77	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GEOG 681 0101
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENVI
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 930
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.86	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.14	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.24	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	4.13	3.94	3.85	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1169/1520	3.50	3.66	4.01	4.19	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.97	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.89	3.94	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 686 0101
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 931
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.16	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.86	3.96	4.23	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.14	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.13	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	3.66	4.01	4.19	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	827/1515	4.33	3.97	4.24	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.89	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.71	4.23	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	57/ 278	4.67	4.62	4.19	4.42	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.91	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.66	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 233	4.67	4.77	4.20	4.53	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 686 0101
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 932
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.16	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.86	3.96	4.23	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.14	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.56	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	3.66	4.01	4.19	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	827/1515	4.33	3.97	4.24	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.89	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.71	4.23	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	57/ 278	4.67	4.62	4.19	4.42	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.91	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.93	4.33	4.66	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 233	4.67	4.77	4.20	4.53	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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