

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0101
 Title GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI
 Instructor: EARICKSON, ROBE
 Enrollment: 116
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 775
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	0	6	23	18	4.19	972/1504	4.09	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	8	19	22	4.29	816/1503	4.34	4.16	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	3	17	26	4.35	701/1290	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.19	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	8	1	2	6	18	13	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.24	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	5	4	19	17	3.82	935/1421	3.70	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	5	10	13	10	3.42	1196/1365	3.42	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	3	15	28	4.47	509/1485	4.53	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	4	44	4.92	591/1504	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	15	22	5	3.70	1157/1483	3.77	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	10	37	4.75	420/1425	4.74	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	6	39	4.83	690/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	3	12	31	4.55	514/1418	4.53	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	14	31	4.62	511/1416	4.53	4.23	4.26	4.21	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	13	32	4.67	171/1199	4.27	4.23	3.97	3.82	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	3	1	5	6	7	3.59	979/1312	3.38	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	4	3	3	3	8	3.38	1143/1303	3.65	4.31	4.24	3.93	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	3	2	2	2	12	3.86	1017/1299	3.93	4.36	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	33	12	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors								
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	1	Major	3		
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24								
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	52	Non-major	50		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0								
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0								
				I	0				Other	8			
				?	0								

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0201
 Title GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 776
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	11	17	15	4.00	1092/1504	4.09	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	14	26	4.40	649/1503	4.34	4.16	4.20	4.16	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	8	14	22	4.24	792/1290	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.19	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	34	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/1453	4.00	4.24	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	9	8	13	13	3.58	1073/1421	3.70	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	43	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1365	3.42	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	12	30	4.60	349/1485	4.53	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	23	20	4.43	1147/1504	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	10	33	3	3.85	1051/1483	3.77	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	12	32	4.73	474/1425	4.74	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	35	4.77	790/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	16	25	4.50	578/1418	4.53	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	17	23	4.44	701/1416	4.53	4.23	4.26	4.21	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	7	8	13	16	3.86	766/1199	4.27	4.23	3.97	3.82	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	6	2	4	8	5	3.16	1117/1312	3.38	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	1	6	8	9	3.92	975/1303	3.65	4.31	4.24	3.93	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	0	5	7	11	4.00	922/1299	3.93	4.36	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	21	23	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 105 0101
 Title WORLD REGIONAL GEOGRAP
 Instructor: CARTER, CATHERI
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 777
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	7	10	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	1094/1503	3.96	4.16	4.20	4.16	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	9	10	4.04	919/1290	4.04	4.30	4.28	4.19	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.24	4.21	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	903/1421	3.86	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1365	****	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	750/1485	4.26	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	1300/1504	4.22	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	7	11	2	3.67	1170/1483	3.67	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	773/1426	4.78	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	11	9	4.26	838/1418	4.26	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	799/1416	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.21	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	455/1199	4.30	4.23	3.97	3.82	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	917/1312	3.73	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	619/1303	4.45	4.31	4.24	3.93	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	786/1299	4.27	4.36	4.25	3.94	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GEOG 110 0201
 Title GEOG OF ENV SYSTEMS
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 778
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	8	15	4.21	953/1504	4.21	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	780/1503	4.31	4.16	4.20	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	19	4.52	497/1290	4.52	4.30	4.28	4.19	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.24	4.21	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	5	5	13	4.16	623/1421	4.16	3.64	4.00	3.91	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1365	****	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	18	4.34	659/1485	4.34	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	18	4.64	999/1504	4.64	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	14	6	4.04	827/1483	4.04	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	7	18	4.41	888/1425	4.41	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	10	14	4.24	857/1418	4.24	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	20	4.41	740/1416	4.41	4.23	4.26	4.21	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	207/1199	4.62	4.23	3.97	3.82	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1134/1312	3.08	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.36	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.38	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.62	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.61	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.05	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.93	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.64	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.43	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.25	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.57	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	4.50	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: GEOG 110 0201
 Title GEOG OF ENV SYSTEMS
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 778
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 120 0101
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 779
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	10	39	4.57	455/1504	4.11	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	13	38	4.55	437/1503	4.08	4.16	4.20	4.16	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	46	4.79	220/1290	4.09	4.30	4.28	4.19	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	45	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	****/1453	3.63	4.24	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	25	10	4	6	7	3	2.63	1382/1421	3.16	3.64	4.00	3.91	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	50	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1365	****	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	8	41	4.64	319/1485	4.55	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	35	20	4.36	1200/1504	4.65	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	17	28	4.40	457/1483	3.78	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.40

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	9	42	4.70	510/1425	4.50	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	51	4.94	301/1426	4.77	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	13	37	4.57	488/1418	4.18	4.27	4.25	4.20	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	49	4.89	164/1416	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.21	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	8	16	24	4.22	527/1199	4.18	4.23	3.97	3.82	4.22

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	1	5	7	14	3.93	784/1312	3.56	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	3	2	5	7	13	3.83	1020/1303	3.73	4.31	4.24	3.93	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	2	2	6	19	4.33	741/1299	4.07	4.36	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	25	27	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.80	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.93	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.43	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	11	C	16	General	9	Under-grad	56	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GEOG 120 0201
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 780
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	6	13	5	3.64	1309/1504	4.11	4.37	4.27	4.13	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	15	4	3.61	1272/1503	4.08	4.16	4.20	4.16	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	11	4	3.39	1177/1290	4.09	4.30	4.28	4.19	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1245/1453	3.63	4.24	4.21	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	7	10	3.68	1010/1421	3.16	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1365	****	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	509/1485	4.55	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	525/1504	4.65	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	1	10	9	2	3.15	1355/1483	3.78	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	1008/1425	4.50	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	20	4.59	1057/1426	4.77	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	7	8	9	3.78	1154/1418	4.18	4.27	4.25	4.20	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	5	6	11	3.70	1189/1416	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.21	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	4	9	12	4.15	574/1199	4.18	4.23	3.97	3.82	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	8	5	1	3.19	1112/1312	3.56	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1089/1303	3.73	4.31	4.24	3.93	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1033/1299	4.07	4.36	4.25	3.94	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GEOG 280 0101
 Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 781
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	737/1504	4.38	4.37	4.27	4.26	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	601/1290	4.44	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	855/1453	4.19	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	5	5	1	3.20	1256/1421	3.20	3.64	4.00	3.90	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.13	4.08	4.00	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	914/1485	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	506/1483	4.36	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	830/1425	4.47	4.51	4.41	4.40	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	596/1426	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	990/1418	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.22	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	862/1416	4.27	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	386/1199	4.38	4.23	3.97	3.95	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	530/1312	4.33	3.80	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	869/1299	4.14	4.36	4.25	4.21	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 233	4.83	4.38	4.09	4.30	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	107/ 244	4.40	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	64/ 227	4.75	4.62	4.40	4.58	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 225	4.80	4.61	4.23	4.52	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	93/ 207	4.20	4.05	4.09	4.22	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 306 0101
 Title FIELD ECOLOGY
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 782
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	295/1504	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	642/1290	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	300/1453	4.64	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	943/1421	3.80	3.64	4.00	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	205/1365	4.64	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	319/1485	4.64	4.12	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	842/1425	4.45	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	714/1426	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	542/1199	4.20	4.23	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	4.17	3.80	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.67	4.01	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	102/ 233	4.33	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	158/ 227	4.33	4.62	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.61	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	96/ 207	4.17	4.05	4.09	4.14	4.17
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	46/ 58	4.20	4.57	4.43	4.52	4.20
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	27/ 56	4.60	4.25	4.23	4.13	4.60
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/ 44	4.80	4.90	4.65	4.77	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	22/ 47	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.14	4.60
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	29/ 39	4.20	4.27	4.44	4.47	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	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	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: GEOG 314 0101
 Title GEOGRAPHY OF SOILS
 Instructor: Robin, Jessica
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 783
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	8	20	4.37	737/1504	4.37	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	10	14	7	3.66	1251/1503	3.66	4.16	4.20	4.22	3.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	8	9	11	3.63	1123/1290	3.63	4.30	4.28	4.31	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	13	15	4.09	957/1453	4.09	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	6	7	8	8	3.30	1222/1421	3.30	3.64	4.00	4.01	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	11	13	3.97	818/1365	3.97	4.13	4.08	4.08	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	4	5	12	12	3.88	1098/1485	3.88	4.12	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	4.69	968/1504	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	9	16	4	3.71	1153/1483	3.71	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	10	24	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	7	9	15	3.97	1038/1418	3.97	4.27	4.25	4.26	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	8	21	4.43	727/1416	4.43	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	0	8	7	14	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.23	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	887/1312	3.79	3.80	4.00	4.09	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	822/1299	4.21	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.67	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.38	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.62	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.61	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.05	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	35	Non-major	8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GEOG 329 0101
 Title GEOG OF DISEASE & HEAL
 Instructor: EARICKSON, ROBE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 784
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	6	11	4.09	1052/1504	4.09	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	9	4.18	919/1503	4.18	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	15	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	968/1453	4.06	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.64	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	0	0	4	4	3.55	1133/1365	3.55	4.13	4.08	4.08	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	795/1485	4.23	4.12	4.16	4.17	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	2	11	3	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	17	4.59	676/1425	4.59	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	790/1426	4.77	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	213/1199	4.60	4.23	3.97	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	1186/1312	2.91	3.80	4.00	4.09	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1028/1303	3.82	4.31	4.24	4.27	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 342 0101
 Title METROPOLITAN BALTIMORE
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 785
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	15	4.23	869/1503	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.30	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	418/1453	4.52	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	13	8	3.89	871/1421	3.89	3.64	4.00	4.01	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	8	13	4.07	742/1365	4.07	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	13	14	4.41	577/1485	4.41	4.12	4.16	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	15	12	4.34	530/1483	4.34	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	420/1425	4.76	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	354/1418	4.69	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	366/1416	4.72	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	5	7	12	3.96	680/1199	3.96	4.23	3.97	4.02	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	454/1312	4.41	3.80	4.00	4.09	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	641/1303	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	530/1299	4.56	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	30	Non-major	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 352 0101
 Title GEOG OF CRIME & JUSTIC
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 786
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	678/1503	4.39	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	280/1290	4.72	4.30	4.28	4.31	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.64	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1365	****	4.13	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.12	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	514/1418	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	394/1199	4.38	4.23	3.97	4.02	4.38

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	993/1312	3.56	3.80	4.00	4.09	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	815/1303	4.22	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 383 0101
 Title STAT/THEMATIC CARTOGRP
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 787
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	624/1504	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	574/1290	4.45	4.30	4.28	4.31	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	2	1	3.33	1207/1421	3.33	3.64	4.00	4.01	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.12	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.64	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	526/1418	4.55	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	688/1416	4.45	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	247/1199	4.55	4.23	3.97	4.02	4.55

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	922/1312	3.71	3.80	4.00	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1103/1303	3.57	4.31	4.24	4.27	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	780/1299	4.29	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.00	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.38	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.62	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.61	4.23	4.29	****

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 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GEOG 386 0101
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 788
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	318/1504	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	869/1503	4.24	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1116/1290	3.65	4.30	4.28	4.31	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	2	4	2	0	2.45	1394/1421	2.45	3.64	4.00	4.01	2.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.12	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	812/1504	4.81	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	947/1483	3.93	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	940/1426	4.69	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	964/1418	4.13	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	446/1199	4.31	4.23	3.97	4.02	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	986/1312	3.57	3.80	4.00	4.09	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	776/1303	4.29	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.36	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	71/ 233	4.50	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	41/ 227	4.90	4.62	4.40	4.46	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	103/ 225	4.50	4.61	4.23	4.29	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	84/ 207	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.14	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 400A 0101
 Title SLCTD TPS IN GEOG GIS
 Instructor: ADAMS, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 789
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1175/1421	3.40	3.64	4.00	4.02	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	967/1365	3.80	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1312/1485	3.40	4.12	4.16	4.14	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.23	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.80	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.36	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 405 0101
 Title APP LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 790
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	901/1453	4.14	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1162/1421	3.43	3.64	4.00	4.02	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1118/1365	3.57	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	727/1485	4.29	4.12	4.16	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1041/1483	3.86	4.02	4.06	4.11	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	947/1418	4.14	4.27	4.25	4.25	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1225/1416	3.57	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	471/1199	4.29	4.23	3.97	4.05	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.80	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.36	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	39/ 58	4.60	4.57	4.43	4.83	4.60
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	49/ 56	3.40	4.25	4.23	4.37	3.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/ 44	4.80	4.90	4.65	4.33	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	22/ 47	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.12	4.60
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	35/ 39	3.60	4.27	4.44	4.19	3.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 415 0101
 Title CLIMATE CHANGE
 Instructor: MEHTA, AMITA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 791
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	1318/1504	3.61	4.37	4.27	4.33	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	3	3	3.06	1413/1503	3.06	4.16	4.20	4.18	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1050/1290	3.83	4.30	4.28	4.32	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	1155/1453	3.82	4.24	4.21	4.22	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.64	4.00	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	4	6	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	8	3	2	2	2.65	1442/1485	2.65	4.12	4.16	4.14	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1397/1504	4.06	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	5	5	5	0	2.88	1405/1483	2.88	4.02	4.06	4.11	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1308/1425	3.50	4.51	4.41	4.38	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	1169/1426	4.44	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	1	4	5	4	3.22	1311/1418	3.22	4.27	4.25	4.25	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	6	2	4	3.06	1321/1416	3.06	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	2	3	6	3	3.24	1011/1199	3.24	4.23	3.97	4.05	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	1121/1312	3.14	3.80	4.00	4.07	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	869/1299	4.14	4.36	4.25	4.38	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.93	4.35	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General		6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	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		8				
				?	1							

Course-Section: GEOG 416 0101
 Title HYDROLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 792
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	532/1453	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1222/1421	3.30	3.64	4.00	4.02	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	708/1365	4.13	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1206/1485	3.70	4.12	4.16	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1138/1504	4.44	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1093/1483	4.07	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.07

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	1	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.27	4.25	4.25	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	748/1199	3.90	4.23	3.97	4.05	3.90

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.80	4.00	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.38	4.33

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	116/ 233	4.25	4.38	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	190/ 244	3.67	4.25	4.09	3.56	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.62	4.40	4.16	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.61	4.23	3.81	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	182/ 207	3.33	4.05	4.09	3.69	3.33

Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.25	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.57	4.29	4.12	****

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 3		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
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

Course-Section: GEOG 416 0101
 Title HYDROLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 793
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	532/1453	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1222/1421	3.30	3.64	4.00	4.02	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	708/1365	4.13	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1206/1485	3.70	4.12	4.16	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1138/1504	4.44	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.07	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.80	4.00	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.38	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	116/ 233	4.25	4.38	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	190/ 244	3.67	4.25	4.09	3.56	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.62	4.40	4.16	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.61	4.23	3.81	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	182/ 207	3.33	4.05	4.09	3.69	3.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.25	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.57	4.29	4.12	****

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	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 10	Non-major 0
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 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: GEOG 432 0101
 Title SEM/NATURAL RESOURCES
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 794
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	532/1453	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	145/1421	4.78	3.64	4.00	4.02	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	91/1365	4.89	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1098/1485	3.89	4.12	4.16	4.14	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1376/1504	4.11	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.02	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.27	4.25	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.86	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	177/1199	4.67	4.23	3.97	4.05	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.80	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.36	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.67	4.01	4.17	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.50	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	25/ 70	4.86	4.93	4.35	4.63	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	44/ 67	4.29	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.29
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 76	4.86	4.43	4.44	4.51	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 450 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL GEOG
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 795
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.16	4.20	4.18	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.24	4.21	4.22	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	3.64	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	602/1483	4.29	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.29

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.27	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1312/1416	3.14	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	471/1199	4.29	4.23	3.97	4.05	4.29

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	651/1312	4.17	3.80	4.00	4.07	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.36	4.25	4.38	4.50

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.93	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.64	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.43	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 480 0101
 Title ADV CARTOGRAPHIC APPL
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 796
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	482/1504	4.56	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	981/1503	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.30	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	926/1485	4.11	4.12	4.16	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	682/1418	4.43	4.27	4.25	4.25	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	964/1199	3.40	4.23	3.97	4.05	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.80	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.36	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 481 0101
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, PETYA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 797
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	561/1290	4.46	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	963/1453	4.08	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1150/1421	3.44	3.64	4.00	4.02	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	737/1365	4.08	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1128/1485	3.83	4.12	4.16	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.64	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1008/1426	4.64	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	828/1418	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.25	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	997/1416	4.09	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.23	3.97	4.05	4.50

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1051/1312	3.40	3.80	4.00	4.07	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1038/1299	3.80	4.36	4.25	4.38	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.17	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.38	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.62	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.61	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 207	****	4.05	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 486 0101
 Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 798
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	826/1504	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.16	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	1	1	3	2.73	1372/1421	2.73	3.64	4.00	4.02	2.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	953/1485	4.08	4.12	4.16	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	760/1504	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	940/1425	4.36	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1008/1426	4.64	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1136/1418	3.82	4.27	4.25	4.25	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1207/1416	3.64	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1013/1199	3.22	4.23	3.97	4.05	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1121/1312	3.14	3.80	4.00	4.07	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1103/1303	3.57	4.31	4.24	4.34	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.36	4.25	4.38	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.67	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.38	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.62	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.61	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.05	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.50	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.93	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	4.64	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.43	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.43	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						

56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 799
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.16	4.20	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.24	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.64	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.13	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.12	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.79	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.27	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.23	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.36	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.67	4.01	4.24	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	143/ 233	4.00	4.38	4.09	4.56	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.09	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.62	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.61	4.23	4.69	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.05	4.09	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	66/ 76	4.00	4.50	4.61	4.57	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.93	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.64	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.43	4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	40/ 58	4.50	4.57	4.43	4.31	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.25	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.90	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.57	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.27	4.44	4.55	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.50	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.75	5.00

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 799
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 616 0101
 Title PHYSICAL HYDROLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 800
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.64	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.13	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.12	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.79	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.51	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.27	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.23	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.36	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.67	4.01	4.24	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	71/ 233	4.50	4.38	4.09	4.56	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.09	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	179/ 227	4.00	4.62	4.40	4.66	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.61	4.23	4.69	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.40	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.57	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 56	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.90	4.65	4.74	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.50	4.53	4.37	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.75	5.00

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	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	2

84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	2
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant