

Course Section: GES 102 0101  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH  
 Enrollment: 100  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 963  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	7	14	4.06	1131/1669	4.20	4.45	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	16	4.31	801/1666	4.43	4.37	4.19	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	16	4.22	847/1421	4.31	4.44	4.24	4.11	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	946/1617	4.30	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	8	9	7	3.55	1202/1555	3.84	3.65	4.00	3.92	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	313/1647	4.72	4.27	4.12	4.06	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	285/1668	4.71	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	10	11	8	3.93	1039/1605	4.03	4.25	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	360/1514	4.79	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	899/1551	4.83	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	399/1503	4.67	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	12	18	4.50	642/1506	4.62	4.48	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	10	18	4.50	264/1311	4.36	4.28	3.85	3.68	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	4	4	4	2.85	1389/1490	3.68	3.84	4.05	3.85	2.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	8	5	3	2	2.59	1467/1502	3.58	4.00	4.26	4.06	2.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	1	4	5	6	3.53	1270/1489	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.07	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	15	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.04	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 11	Required for Majors 23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 15	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 31
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 4

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: GES 102 0201  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 964  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	9	12	23	4.15	1052/1669	4.20	4.45	4.23	4.02	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	14	28	4.44	648/1666	4.43	4.37	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	17	20	4.13	916/1421	4.31	4.44	4.24	4.11	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	36	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	****/1617	4.30	4.25	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	19	18	4.06	734/1555	3.84	3.65	4.00	3.92	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	38	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	****/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	37	4.66	313/1647	4.72	4.27	4.12	4.06	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	6	22	16	4.23	1400/1668	4.71	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	8	21	11	4.07	871/1605	4.03	4.25	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	36	4.70	537/1514	4.79	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	40	4.87	622/1551	4.83	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	11	33	4.67	373/1503	4.67	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	10	33	4.63	509/1506	4.62	4.48	4.26	4.17	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	8	13	19	4.02	577/1311	4.36	4.28	3.85	3.68	4.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	7	9	17	4.08	816/1490	3.68	3.84	4.05	3.85	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	10	8	15	3.94	1075/1502	3.58	4.00	4.26	4.06	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	4	11	20	4.39	818/1489	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.07	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	31	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	15	General	7	Under-grad	48	Non-major	43
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

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	4	0	0	3	6	21	39	4.39	745/1669	4.20	4.45	4.23	4.02	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	26	40	4.54	516/1666	4.43	4.37	4.19	4.11	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	22	44	4.59	475/1421	4.31	4.44	4.24	4.11	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	38	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	525/1617	4.30	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	6	15	18	26	3.90	947/1555	3.84	3.65	4.00	3.92	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	53	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	****/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	11	57	4.84	150/1647	4.72	4.27	4.12	4.06	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	3	65	4.93	570/1668	4.71	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	2	10	25	18	4.07	871/1605	4.03	4.25	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	8	60	4.86	274/1514	4.79	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	8	61	4.88	567/1551	4.83	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	13	51	4.69	347/1503	4.67	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	3	9	55	4.74	380/1506	4.62	4.48	4.26	4.17	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	7	14	44	4.57	237/1311	4.36	4.28	3.85	3.68	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	4	9	17	26	4.11	808/1490	3.68	3.84	4.05	3.85	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	3	11	15	28	4.19	920/1502	3.58	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	2	14	39	4.58	622/1489	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.07	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	42	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.65	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.37	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.80	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	3.00	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	71	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	2.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: GES 102 0301  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 123  
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 965  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	73	Non-major	71
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	4						

Course Section: GES 110 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 115  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 966  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	17	43	4.61	478/1669	4.61	4.45	4.23	4.02	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	19	41	4.58	472/1666	4.58	4.37	4.19	4.11	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	14	45	4.63	441/1421	4.63	4.44	4.24	4.11	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	44	1	3	0	4	12	4.15	911/1617	4.15	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	6	5	7	13	21	3.73	1079/1555	3.73	3.65	4.00	3.92	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	53	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	****/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	3	9	50	4.71	250/1647	4.71	4.27	4.12	4.06	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	43	20	4.32	1345/1668	4.32	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	1	5	28	21	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.25	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	56	4.92	170/1514	4.92	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	58	4.93	358/1551	4.93	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	6	51	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	55	4.82	273/1506	4.82	4.48	4.26	4.17	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	4	5	49	4.56	237/1311	4.56	4.28	3.85	3.68	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	3	7	8	20	4.10	808/1490	4.10	3.84	4.05	3.85	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	2	2	9	25	4.41	741/1502	4.41	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	1	6	11	20	4.23	930/1489	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.07	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	32	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.09	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 97	****	4.37	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.80	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	3.00	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 29	****	2.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: GES 110 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 115  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 966  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	2	B	28						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	11	Under-grad	65	Non-major	59
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	2						

Course Section: GES 120 0101  
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI  
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE  
 Enrollment: 118  
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 967  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	0	0	1	6	8	54	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.45	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	13	52	4.66	372/1666	4.66	4.37	4.19	4.11	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	13	51	4.65	405/1421	4.65	4.44	4.24	4.11	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	48	1	0	5	4	9	4.05	999/1617	4.05	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	10	7	24	9	5	2.85	1476/1555	2.85	3.65	4.00	3.92	2.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	59	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	8	9	50	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.27	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	67	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	0	1	19	37	4.57	328/1605	4.57	4.25	4.07	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	8	58	4.78	392/1514	4.78	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	67	4.96	256/1551	4.96	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	4	14	47	4.54	519/1503	4.54	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	62	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.48	4.26	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	3	10	19	31	4.24	458/1311	4.24	4.28	3.85	3.68	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	8	12	20	4.24	701/1490	4.24	3.84	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	2	2	6	10	22	4.14	950/1502	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	4	11	26	4.54	657/1489	4.54	4.24	4.29	4.07	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	34	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	70	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.65	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	4.37	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	69	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 105	****	4.80	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	69	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	3.00	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 29	****	2.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: GES 120 0101  
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI  
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE  
 Enrollment: 118  
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 967  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	8	Under-grad	72	Non-major	67
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	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	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	360/1669	4.69	4.45	4.23	4.34	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	483/1666	4.56	4.37	4.19	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.44	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	911/1617	4.15	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	2	6	3.60	1178/1555	3.60	3.65	4.00	3.96	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1006/1543	3.92	3.98	4.06	4.10	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.27	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	423/1605	4.47	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	553/1514	4.69	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	1083/1551	4.63	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	670/1503	4.44	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	521/1506	4.63	4.48	4.26	4.33	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.28	3.85	3.96	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1088/1490	3.67	3.84	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	938/1502	4.17	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.57	4.00	3.99	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.65	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course Section: GES 220 0101  
 Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 969  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	16	4.89	143/1669	4.89	4.45	4.23	4.34	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.37	4.19	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	728/1555	4.08	3.65	4.00	3.96	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.98	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.27	4.12	4.19	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	59/1605	4.94	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	312/1503	4.72	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1506	4.72	4.48	4.26	4.33	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	389/1311	4.33	4.28	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.84	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	456/1489	4.73	4.24	4.29	4.36	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	110/1006	4.86	4.57	4.00	3.99	4.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	16/ 226	4.93	4.60	4.20	4.42	4.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	44/ 233	4.80	4.35	4.19	4.36	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	38/ 225	4.93	4.66	4.50	4.74	4.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	49/ 223	4.87	4.65	4.35	4.71	4.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	63/ 206	4.60	4.50	4.15	4.59	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 5	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 15
				? 0	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: GES 280 0101  
 Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 970  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.45	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.37	4.19	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.44	4.24	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.96	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	2	2	3.09	1394/1543	3.09	3.98	4.06	4.10	3.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	4.27	4.12	4.19	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	551/1605	4.36	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1172/1514	4.10	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1168/1503	3.90	4.37	4.24	4.29	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	547/1506	4.60	4.48	4.26	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	365/1311	4.36	4.28	3.85	3.96	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.84	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1179/1502	3.80	4.00	4.26	4.31	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1168/1489	3.80	4.24	4.29	4.36	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/ 226	4.86	4.60	4.20	4.42	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	170/ 233	3.88	4.35	4.19	4.36	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	83/ 225	4.75	4.66	4.50	4.74	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	93/ 223	4.63	4.65	4.35	4.71	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	66/ 206	4.57	4.50	4.15	4.59	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	4.37	4.36	4.60	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.80	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	55/ 58	2.00	3.33	4.22	4.20	2.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	3.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	2.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: GES 280 0101  
 Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 970  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course Section: GES 311 0101  
 Title WEATHER AND CLIMATE  
 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 971  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	605/1666	4.46	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	607/1421	4.46	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	3	10	10	4.08	981/1617	4.08	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	8	10	3.75	1062/1555	3.75	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	3	1	0	10	6	3.75	1138/1543	3.75	3.98	4.06	4.14	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	617/1647	4.43	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	1144/1668	4.57	4.73	4.67	4.68	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	9	17	4.56	335/1605	4.56	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	360/1514	4.81	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	491/1503	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	22	4.69	433/1506	4.69	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	137/1311	4.76	4.28	3.85	3.97	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1490	****	3.84	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/1502	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/1489	****	4.24	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.45	****	

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 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 6	Under-grad 30	Non-major 22
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 2			

Course Section: GES 313 0101  
 Title BIOGEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 972  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	11	16	4.35	793/1669	4.35	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	16	14	4.42	626/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	734/1555	4.06	3.65	4.00	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	16	9	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	232/1647	4.73	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	901/1668	4.81	4.73	4.67	4.68	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	11	12	4.21	737/1605	4.21	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	4	22	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	8	17	4.27	870/1503	4.27	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	5	10	12	4.07	557/1311	4.07	4.28	3.85	3.97	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	824/1490	4.06	3.84	4.05	4.11	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	893/1502	4.24	4.00	4.26	4.28	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	511/1489	4.69	4.24	4.29	4.35	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	360/1006	4.30	4.57	4.00	4.10	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 7	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 31 Non-major 24
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 8	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 22	
			? 1		

Course Section: GES 318 0101  
 Title NATL ENVRN CHESPKE BAY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 973  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	2	5	22	4.57	522/1669	4.57	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	14	4.17	984/1666	4.17	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	645/1421	4.43	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	5	10	11	4.04	1011/1617	4.04	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	6	15	4.10	709/1555	4.10	3.65	4.00	4.03	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	4	11	8	3.81	1092/1543	3.81	3.98	4.06	4.14	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	11	11	3.90	1161/1647	3.90	4.27	4.12	4.14	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	21	7	4.17	1438/1668	4.17	4.73	4.67	4.68	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	17	7	4.07	871/1605	4.07	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	5	18	4.46	861/1514	4.46	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	825/1551	4.79	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	4	10	11	3.96	1106/1503	3.96	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	6	17	4.29	884/1506	4.29	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	4	11	8	3.85	738/1311	3.85	4.28	3.85	3.97	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1265/1490	3.25	3.84	4.05	4.11	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	986/1502	4.08	4.00	4.26	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1018/1489	4.08	4.24	4.29	4.35	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	9	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: GES 330 0101  
 Title GEOG OF ECON DEVELOPME  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 974  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	11	4.79	231/1669	4.79	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	592/1555	4.21	3.65	4.00	4.03	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.98	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1406/1668	4.21	4.73	4.67	4.68	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	486/1605	4.42	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	151/1514	4.93	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	412/1503	4.64	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	407/1506	4.71	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	349/1311	4.38	4.28	3.85	3.97	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	3.84	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.00	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.24	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 14 Non-major 10
84-150	6	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 7	
			? 0		



Course Section: GES 350 0101  
 Title SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 975  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	268/1666	4.74	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	4	6	3.56	1202/1555	3.56	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1076/1543	3.83	3.98	4.06	4.14	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	617/1605	4.31	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	451/1503	4.61	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	249/1506	4.83	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	169/1311	4.71	4.28	3.85	3.97	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1003/1490	3.80	3.84	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	1245/1502	3.69	4.00	4.26	4.28	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.24	4.29	4.35	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.65	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.37	4.36	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.80	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: GES 381 0101  
 Title REMOTE SENSING  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 976  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	6	7	4.43	705/1669	4.43	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	935/1666	4.21	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	701/1421	4.38	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.93	4.73	4.67	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	631/1605	4.30	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.85	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	409/1551	4.92	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	621/1503	4.46	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	101/1311	4.85	4.28	3.85	3.97	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	4.20	3.84	4.05	4.11	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	938/1502	4.17	4.00	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.24	4.29	4.35	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 226	4.75	4.60	4.20	4.17	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	114/ 233	4.25	4.35	4.19	4.13	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	127/ 225	4.50	4.66	4.50	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	109/ 223	4.50	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 206	4.75	4.50	4.15	4.08	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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	10				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 977  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1124/1669	3.99	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1054/1666	4.04	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	901/1421	4.07	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1029/1617	4.06	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	4	1	3	3	0	2.45	1527/1555	2.78	3.65	4.00	4.03	2.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1180/1543	3.85	3.98	4.06	4.14	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	1260/1647	3.94	4.27	4.12	4.14	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	918/1605	4.29	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	799/1514	4.55	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	825/1551	4.84	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1066/1503	4.10	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	1258/1506	3.86	4.48	4.26	4.30	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	0	3	7	3.92	676/1311	4.41	4.28	3.85	3.97	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	1	0	3	1	2.56	1427/1490	3.11	3.84	4.05	4.11	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1390/1502	3.41	4.00	4.26	4.28	3.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1223/1489	3.78	4.24	4.29	4.35	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	133/ 226	4.33	4.60	4.20	4.17	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	127/ 233	4.58	4.35	4.19	4.13	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	75/ 225	4.90	4.66	4.50	4.45	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	109/ 223	4.75	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 206	4.63	4.50	4.15	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	10

Course Section: GES 386 0102  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 978  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3	1	5	3.90	1288/1669	3.99	4.45	4.23	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.04	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	969/1421	4.07	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	958/1617	4.06	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	0	3	3.11	1410/1555	2.78	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	895/1543	3.85	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	992/1647	3.94	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.29	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	679/1514	4.55	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.84	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	932/1503	4.10	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	1069/1506	3.86	4.48	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.41	4.28	3.85	3.97	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1088/1490	3.11	3.84	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	0	0	1	6	3.70	1237/1502	3.41	4.00	4.26	4.28	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	1133/1489	3.78	4.24	4.29	4.35	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.10	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	77/ 226	4.33	4.60	4.20	4.17	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 233	4.58	4.35	4.19	4.13	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.90	4.66	4.50	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 223	4.75	4.65	4.35	4.27	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	103/ 206	4.63	4.50	4.15	4.08	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.90	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.37	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.80	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	3.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	2.00	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: GES 386 0102  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 978  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: GES 406 0101  
 Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: BELT, KENNETH T  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 979  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	8	9	4.32	840/1669	4.32	4.45	4.23	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	5	6	3.68	1372/1666	3.68	4.37	4.19	4.22	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	5	6	3.84	1095/1421	3.84	4.44	4.24	4.38	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1112/1617	3.94	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	7	3	3.53	1217/1555	3.53	3.65	4.00	4.08	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	6	6	3.68	1185/1543	3.68	3.98	4.06	4.18	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	6	6	4	3.61	1347/1647	3.61	4.27	4.12	4.14	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.73	4.67	4.70	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	9	1	3.65	1286/1605	3.65	4.25	4.07	4.16	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1136/1514	4.17	4.60	4.39	4.45	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	936/1551	4.72	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1127/1503	3.94	4.37	4.24	4.27	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	980/1506	4.17	4.48	4.26	4.29	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	718/1311	3.88	4.28	3.85	3.88	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1490	****	3.84	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1382/1502	3.17	4.00	4.26	4.46	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1489	****	4.24	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.60	4.20	4.61	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	146/ 233	4.00	4.35	4.19	4.40	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	187/ 225	4.00	4.66	4.50	4.39	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	126/ 223	4.43	4.65	4.35	4.56	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	144/ 206	3.86	4.50	4.15	4.20	3.86	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	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	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: GES 416 0101  
 Title HYDROLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 980  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	2	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.45	4.23	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	1	3.90	1235/1666	3.90	4.37	4.19	4.22	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.44	4.24	4.38	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.65	4.00	4.08	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1035/1543	3.89	3.98	4.06	4.18	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1440/1647	3.40	4.27	4.12	4.14	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1418/1668	4.20	4.73	4.67	4.70	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.60	4.39	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1261/1503	3.70	4.37	4.24	4.27	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1025/1506	4.10	4.48	4.26	4.29	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	718/1311	3.88	4.28	3.85	3.88	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1117/1490	3.60	3.84	4.05	4.26	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.00	4.26	4.46	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1168/1489	3.80	4.24	4.29	4.52	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.65	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	30/ 58	4.67	3.33	4.22	3.94	4.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 9	Non-major 10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 1			

Course Section: GES 451 0101  
 Title GLOBAL CHANGE, URBAN  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 981  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	5	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.45	4.23	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	634/1666	4.44	4.37	4.19	4.22	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.44	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.65	4.00	4.08	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1543	4.44	3.98	4.06	4.18	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1240/1668	4.44	4.73	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1166/1514	4.11	4.60	4.39	4.45	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	510/1503	4.56	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	594/1506	4.56	4.48	4.26	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1072/1311	3.20	4.28	3.85	3.88	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	417/1490	4.56	3.84	4.05	4.26	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.00	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.52	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	625/1006	3.86	4.57	4.00	4.21	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	46/ 112	4.80	4.90	4.38	4.74	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	47/ 97	4.60	4.37	4.36	4.69	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	57/ 92	4.20	4.60	4.22	4.48	4.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.80	4.20	4.27	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.86	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.22	3.94	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course Section: GES 481 0101  
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV  
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 982  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.45	4.23	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1001/1666	4.14	4.37	4.19	4.22	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.44	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1373/1555	3.22	3.65	4.00	4.08	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	771/1543	4.15	3.98	4.06	4.18	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	1260/1647	3.79	4.27	4.12	4.14	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1233/1605	3.73	4.25	4.07	4.16	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1052/1514	4.31	4.60	4.39	4.45	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1097/1551	4.62	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1193/1503	3.85	4.37	4.24	4.27	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.48	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	687/1311	3.92	4.28	3.85	3.88	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.84	4.05	4.26	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1385/1502	3.14	4.00	4.26	4.46	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	1310/1489	3.43	4.24	4.29	4.52	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1006	****	4.57	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.60	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.35	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.66	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.65	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	4.50	4.15	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: GES 491 0114  
 Title IND STUDY GEOG/ENV SYS  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 983  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.45	4.23	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.65	4.00	4.08	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.98	4.06	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.60	4.39	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.48	4.26	4.29	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.84	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.00	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.21	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.90	4.38	4.74	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.37	4.36	4.69	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.80	4.20	4.27	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	27/ 46	4.67	4.67	4.45	4.92	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	28/ 33	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.00	3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	29/ 29	2.00	2.00	4.34	2.00	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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