

Course-Section: GES 102 0201  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 109  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 903  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	16	16	28	4.08	1136/1649	4.13	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	22	31	4.24	920/1648	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	17	28	4.02	946/1375	4.04	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	38	1	4	4	4	12	3.88	1213/1595	3.82	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	5	8	12	22	12	3.47	1269/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	47	2	1	4	2	5	3.50	****/1512	3.81	4.09	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	14	42	4.60	395/1623	4.52	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	20	40	4.61	1103/1646	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	17	31	13	3.93	1016/1621	3.98	4.13	4.06	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	13	45	4.65	667/1568	4.70	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	13	45	4.65	1096/1572	4.74	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	24	31	4.37	812/1564	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	20	36	4.48	736/1559	4.55	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	1	12	14	28	4.14	599/1352	4.18	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	****/1384	****	3.95	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	54	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	8	Under-grad	63	Non-major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 102 0301  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 119  
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 904  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	17	34	34	4.17	1047/1649	4.13	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	29	43	4.31	825/1648	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	19	31	32	4.06	932/1375	4.04	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	41	1	6	8	17	12	3.75	1285/1595	3.82	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	21	24	32	3.94	875/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	52	1	2	9	9	10	3.81	1089/1512	3.81	4.09	4.10	3.86	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	8	25	49	4.44	581/1623	4.52	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	26	56	4.66	1037/1646	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	17	40	19	4.03	903/1621	3.98	4.13	4.06	3.96	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	4	12	64	4.75	480/1568	4.70	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	10	68	4.82	790/1572	4.74	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	8	22	49	4.52	640/1564	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	19	56	4.63	561/1559	4.55	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	3	15	21	38	4.22	534/1352	4.18	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	****/1384	****	3.95	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	75	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	76	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	76	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	7	A 13	Required for Majors 53	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 47					
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 8	General	6	Under-grad	86	Non-major 82
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 2					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	9			
				? 1					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	3	14	8	11	3.68	1422/1649	3.96	4.35	4.28	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	10	4	19	3.92	1208/1648	4.14	4.20	4.23	4.16	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	8	7	20	4.16	875/1375	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	4	1	9	7	8	3.48	1406/1595	3.77	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	3	2	8	3	12	3.68	1133/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	5	4	9	5	6	3.10	1417/1512	3.10	4.09	4.10	3.86	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	6	8	20	4.22	861/1623	4.41	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	1	10	23	2	3.65	1627/1646	3.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	4	1	1	12	12	1	3.41	1405/1621	3.83	4.13	4.06	3.96	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	5	10	18	4.29	1088/1568	4.61	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	6	25	4.62	1133/1572	4.80	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	11	10	12	3.97	1154/1564	4.30	4.37	4.28	4.20	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	9	3	16	3.79	1252/1559	4.22	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	4	4	3	21	4.09	644/1352	4.40	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	8	4	5	2	4	2.57	1343/1384	3.13	3.95	4.08	3.86	2.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	5	3	9	3	4	2.92	1341/1382	3.49	4.20	4.29	4.03	2.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	5	3	6	4	5	3.04	1284/1368	3.67	4.25	4.30	4.01	3.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: GES 110 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA  
 Enrollment: 131  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 905  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 110 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 104  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 906  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	5	11	28	4.24	975/1649	3.96	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	17	25	4.37	756/1648	4.14	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	14	29	4.45	617/1375	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	33	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1032/1595	3.77	4.21	4.20	4.03	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	4	6	14	15	3.74	1074/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	43	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/1512	3.10	4.09	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	36	4.61	382/1623	4.41	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	43	6	4.12	1491/1646	3.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	25	14	4.26	676/1621	3.83	4.13	4.06	3.96	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	44	4.92	220/1568	4.61	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	48	4.98	178/1572	4.80	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	13	32	4.63	511/1564	4.30	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	7	38	4.65	536/1559	4.22	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	9	36	4.70	182/1352	4.40	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	1002/1384	3.13	3.95	4.08	3.86	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	934/1382	3.49	4.20	4.29	4.03	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	821/1368	3.67	4.25	4.30	4.01	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	14	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.31	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 28	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 4	C 7	General 5	Under-grad 50 Non-major 49
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 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	6	0	0	1	9	21	59	4.53	603/1649	4.53	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	3	9	22	55	4.45	643/1648	4.45	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	3	6	22	57	4.47	581/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	60	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	672/1595	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.03	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	15	12	3	16	15	26	3.56	1214/1533	3.56	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	71	0	0	6	2	10	4.22	****/1512	****	4.09	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	7	21	60	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	1	6	80	4.91	664/1646	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	1	0	6	30	35	4.36	559/1621	4.36	4.13	4.06	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	0	0	11	73	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	3	82	4.96	237/1572	4.96	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	7	16	62	4.62	537/1564	4.62	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	5	78	4.87	238/1559	4.87	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	2	12	26	43	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	4	4	8	9	19	3.80	942/1384	3.80	3.95	4.08	3.86	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	2	14	9	21	4.07	932/1382	4.07	4.20	4.29	4.03	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	1	2	8	11	22	4.16	896/1368	4.16	4.25	4.30	4.01	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	51	36	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	92	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	89	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	90	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	90	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	90	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	90	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	91	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	91	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	91	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	90	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	91	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	90	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	90	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	90	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	90	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: GES 120 0101  
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI  
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE  
 Enrollment: 150  
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 907  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General	7	Under-grad	96	Non-major	94
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	5						

Course-Section: GES 220 0101  
 Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 908  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	265/1649	4.81	4.35	4.28	4.29	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	697/1595	4.36	4.21	4.20	4.22	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1159/1533	3.64	3.88	4.04	4.04	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1062/1512	3.85	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	437/1623	4.56	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	816/1646	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	815/1568	4.53	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1559	4.86	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	836/1352	3.88	4.26	3.98	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.95	4.08	3.99	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.20	4.29	4.19	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.25	4.30	4.21	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.88	3.95	3.89	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	14/ 221	4.93	4.78	4.16	4.45	4.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	27/ 243	4.80	4.54	4.12	4.47	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	19/ 212	4.93	4.69	4.40	4.62	4.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	21/ 209	4.93	4.77	4.35	4.64	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	285/ 555	4.57	4.65	4.29	4.33	4.57	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	15

Course-Section: GES 286 0101  
 Title EXPL ENV: GEO-SPAT VIE  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 909  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	17	4.81	274/1649	4.81	4.35	4.28	4.29	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	855/1375	4.19	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.21	4.20	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1533	****	3.88	4.04	4.04	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	619/1621	4.32	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	461/1568	4.76	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	673/1559	4.52	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	240/1352	4.62	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	976/1384	3.73	3.95	4.08	3.99	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	757/1382	4.36	4.20	4.29	4.19	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	601/1368	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.21	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	28/ 221	4.78	4.78	4.16	4.45	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	61/ 243	4.56	4.54	4.12	4.47	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	32/ 212	4.89	4.69	4.40	4.62	4.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.64	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	311/ 555	4.44	4.65	4.29	4.33	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	19/ 52	4.91	4.95	4.06	3.93	4.91	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	22/ 48	4.18	4.59	4.09	4.05	4.18	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	15/ 39	4.80	4.60	4.47	4.49	4.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	16/ 39	4.80	4.90	4.38	3.66	4.80	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	12/ 312	4.78	4.89	3.68	3.59	4.78	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: GES 286 0101  
 Title EXPL ENV: GEO-SPAT VIE  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 909  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 308 0101  
 Title ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 910  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	14	32	4.54	590/1649	4.54	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	19	28	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	19	29	4.54	513/1375	4.54	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	11	25	4.56	428/1595	4.56	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	8	9	6	12	10	3.16	1404/1533	3.16	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	34	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	7	37	4.62	370/1623	4.62	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	29	17	4.32	1356/1646	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	19	20	4.47	415/1621	4.48	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	45	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	42	4.81	815/1572	4.81	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	13	30	4.52	630/1564	4.52	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	37	4.69	475/1559	4.69	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	2	9	28	4.43	379/1352	4.43	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	840/1384	3.95	3.95	4.08	4.11	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	757/1382	4.35	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	2	0	3	1	14	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	7	C	15	General	3	Under-grad	50	Non-major	44
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 311 0101  
 Title WEATHER AND CLIMATE  
 Instructor: MEHTA, AMITA  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 911  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	8	12	9	3.66	1436/1649	3.66	4.35	4.28	4.27	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	7	16	7	3.71	1375/1648	3.71	4.20	4.23	4.18	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	15	15	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	6	12	10	3.94	1161/1595	3.94	4.21	4.20	4.21	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	5	3	13	8	3.65	1153/1533	3.65	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	5	14	8	3.59	1214/1512	3.59	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	10	10	11	3.82	1228/1623	3.82	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	597/1646	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	5	8	8	3	3.38	1415/1621	3.38	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	6	10	15	4.12	1220/1568	4.12	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	931/1572	4.76	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	9	10	10	3.73	1311/1564	3.73	4.37	4.28	4.25	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	5	9	12	3.73	1295/1559	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	2	3	7	13	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	1	5	2	2	2.79	1317/1384	2.79	3.95	4.08	4.11	2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1014/1382	3.93	4.20	4.29	4.37	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1140/1368	3.62	4.25	4.30	4.39	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	21	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.00	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	35	Non-major	26
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
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	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 313 0101  
 Title BIOGEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 912  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	8	16	4.38	816/1649	4.38	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	825/1648	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	334/1375	4.72	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	9	12	4.15	956/1595	4.15	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	6	9	8	3.62	1166/1533	3.62	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	9	10	3.83	1075/1512	3.83	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	581/1623	4.45	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	3	15	10	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	720/1621	4.23	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	755/1568	4.59	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	790/1572	4.83	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	14	8	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	4	18	4.28	952/1559	4.28	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	515/1352	4.25	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	767/1384	4.08	3.95	4.08	4.11	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	594/1368	4.58	4.25	4.30	4.39	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 5 Under-grad 29 Non-major 22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 20
				? 0	

Course-Section: GES 329 0101  
 Title GEOG OF DISEASE & HEAL  
 Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 913  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	7	23	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	23	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	22	4.56	505/1375	4.56	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	1	5	24	4.53	462/1595	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	23	4.44	432/1533	4.44	3.88	4.04	4.05	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	21	4.55	352/1512	4.55	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	6	22	4.53	469/1623	4.53	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	266/1646	4.97	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	676/1621	4.27	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	26	4.72	554/1568	4.72	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	26	4.74	358/1564	4.74	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	499/1559	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	4	2	23	4.45	351/1352	4.45	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	499/1384	4.44	3.95	4.08	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.25	4.30	4.39	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.88	3.95	4.00	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 16	General 10	Under-grad 34	Non-major 17
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 6			
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0			
				P 1			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Course-Section: GES 342 0101  
 Title METROPOLITAN BALTIMORE  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 914  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	5	18	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	12	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	3	17	4.32	743/1375	4.32	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	3	6	10	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	584/1533	4.29	3.88	4.04	4.05	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	849/1512	4.08	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	915/1623	4.16	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	10	6	3.87	1096/1621	3.87	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	667/1568	4.64	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	1109/1564	4.04	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	871/1559	4.36	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	6	5	9	3.78	893/1352	3.78	4.26	3.98	3.97	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	948/1384	3.79	3.95	4.08	4.11	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	929/1382	4.07	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.25	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	9	Under-grad	26	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 381 0101  
 Title REMOTE SENSING  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 915  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	0	3	7	4.70	395/1649	4.70	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	915/1375	4.10	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	580/1595	4.44	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1400/1533	3.17	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	883/1623	4.20	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	720/1621	4.22	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1346/1384	2.50	3.95	4.08	4.11	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1275/1382	3.25	4.20	4.29	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1286/1368	3.00	4.25	4.30	4.39	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	3.88	3.95	4.00	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.78	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	210/ 243	3.50	4.54	4.12	3.89	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	188/ 212	3.75	4.69	4.40	4.21	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	172/ 209	3.75	4.77	4.35	4.12	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/ 555	4.67	4.65	4.29	4.22	4.67
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.60	****

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	Under-grad 11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	9
?	0		

Course-Section: GES 386 0101  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 916  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	3	5	3.87	1303/1649	3.87	4.35	4.28	4.27	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1471/1648	3.53	4.20	4.23	4.18	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	929/1375	4.07	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.67	4.21	4.20	4.21	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	1	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.20	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	5	2	0	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	1	4	4	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1399/1621	3.42	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	967/1572	4.73	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1360/1564	3.60	4.37	4.28	4.25	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1322/1559	3.67	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	7	5	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	1372/1384	1.75	3.95	4.08	4.11	1.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 400B 0101  
 Title POPULATION GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: RATCLIFFE, MICH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 917  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	6	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1648	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1375	4.89	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	150/1595	4.88	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	723/1512	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	475/1559	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	376/1384	4.60	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 400H 0101  
 Title NEGOT OF WATER RES DIS  
 Instructor: RIVERA, MEGAN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 918  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	9	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.88	4.04	4.14	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1371/1623	3.55	4.08	4.16	4.27	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1121/1646	4.58	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	766/1621	4.18	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	389/1352	4.42	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.20	4.29	4.56	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.50

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 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: GES 408 0101  
 Title FIELD ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 919  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.62	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	427/1648	4.62	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	521/1375	4.54	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	462/1595	4.54	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	895/1533	3.92	3.88	4.04	4.14	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	627/1512	4.31	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	469/1623	4.54	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1412/1646	4.23	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	261/1621	4.64	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/1564	4.64	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	549/1559	4.64	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	227/1352	4.64	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.80	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.20	4.29	4.56	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	36/ 221	4.73	4.78	4.16	4.73	4.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	40/ 243	4.73	4.54	4.12	4.61	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	74/ 212	4.73	4.69	4.40	4.57	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	57/ 209	4.73	4.77	4.35	4.63	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	260/ 555	4.73	4.65	4.29	4.41	4.73	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.95	****	

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 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GES 416 0101  
 Title HYDROLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 920  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	161/1648	4.89	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1375	4.89	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/1533	4.33	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1419/1646	4.22	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1621	4.78	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1564	4.89	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.95	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.31	****	

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 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 9 Non-major 6
84-150	7	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 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GES 451 0101  
 Title URBAN SUSTAINABILITY  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 921  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	11	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	825/1648	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	150/1595	4.88	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	180/1533	4.75	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	436/1512	4.47	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	370/1623	4.63	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	816/1646	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	497/1621	4.42	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	779/1568	4.56	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1572	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	620/1564	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	629/1559	4.56	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	175/1384	4.86	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	292/1382	4.86	4.20	4.29	4.56	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	211/1368	4.93	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.43	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	31/ 88	4.87	4.97	4.54	4.66	4.87	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	32/ 85	4.73	4.68	4.47	4.54	4.73	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	26/ 81	4.80	4.97	4.43	4.57	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	39/ 92	4.53	4.20	4.35	4.44	4.53	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	52/ 288	4.40	3.40	3.68	3.71	4.40	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	23/ 53	4.69	4.90	4.30	4.64	4.69	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	4	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	12/ 30	4.44	4.81	4.16	4.24	4.44	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	27/ 41	4.25	4.63	4.43	4.84	4.25	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	13/ 24	4.75	4.88	4.42	4.85	4.75	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						

I	0	Other	10
?	0		

Course-Section: GES 481 0101  
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 922  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	6	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.88	4.04	4.14	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1055/1512	3.86	4.09	4.10	4.26	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1073/1564	4.11	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	275/1352	4.56	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.95	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: GES 481 0101  
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 922  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 601 0101  
 Title INTRO TO GES  
 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 923  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	4	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1229/1648	3.91	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	421/1533	4.45	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1287/1623	3.73	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1240/1646	4.45	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	914/1621	4.05	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.77	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	918/1564	4.23	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	763/1559	4.41	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	351/1384	4.64	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 85	4.67	4.68	4.47	4.50	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	58/ 92	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.42	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	2.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 4 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 7 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	10

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

Course-Section: GES 601 0101  
 Title INTRO TO GES  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 924  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	4	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1229/1648	3.91	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	421/1533	4.45	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1287/1623	3.73	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1240/1646	4.45	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	859/1621	4.05	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.77	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1564	4.23	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	871/1559	4.41	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	351/1384	4.64	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 85	4.67	4.68	4.47	4.50	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	58/ 92	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.42	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	2.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 608 0101  
 Title FIELD ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 925  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.95	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.78	4.16	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.73	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.80	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.97	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.68	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.20	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.06	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.59	4.09	4.47	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.58	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.90	4.38	4.44	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.89	3.68	3.83	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.90	4.30	4.37	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.81	4.16	4.49	5.00	

Course-Section: GES 608 0101  
 Title FIELD ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 925  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	0	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	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: GES 616 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL HYDROLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 926  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1537/1595	3.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.95	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.78	4.16	4.27	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 243	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.61	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 212	4.50	4.69	4.40	4.73	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.80	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.66	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 621 0101  
 Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 927  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1271/1648	3.86	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1512/1623	3.14	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	654/1621	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	956/1568	3.89	4.55	4.43	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	754/1564	3.89	4.37	4.28	4.41	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	804/1559	4.14	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	582/1352	4.17	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1113/1384	3.43	3.95	4.08	4.30	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	4.20	4.29	4.52	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.88	3.95	4.03	2.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 621 0101  
 Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 928  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1271/1648	3.86	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1512/1623	3.14	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1460/1568	3.89	4.55	4.43	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1400/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.89	4.37	4.28	4.41	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1277/1559	4.14	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	4.17	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1113/1384	3.43	3.95	4.08	4.30	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	4.20	4.29	4.52	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.88	3.95	4.03	2.60

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: GES 621 0101  
 Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 929  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1271/1648	3.86	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1512/1623	3.14	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1401/1568	3.89	4.55	4.43	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1297/1564	3.89	4.37	4.28	4.41	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.14	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	690/1352	4.17	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1113/1384	3.43	3.95	4.08	4.30	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	4.20	4.29	4.52	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.88	3.95	4.03	2.60

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: GES 622 0101  
 Title RES DESIGN/URBAN ENV  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 930  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	703/1533	4.17	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1571/1623	2.80	4.08	4.16	4.29	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1621	3.95	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/1568	4.20	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1321/1572	4.20	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	550/1564	4.47	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	832/1559	4.37	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	515/1352	4.25	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/1384	4.83	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	887/1382	4.17	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 622 0101  
 Title RES DESIGN/URBAN ENV  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 931  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.40		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	703/1533	4.17	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1571/1623	2.80	4.08	4.16	4.29	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.95	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1279/1568	4.20	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1463/1572	4.20	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.47	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	901/1559	4.37	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	4.25	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/1384	4.83	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	887/1382	4.17	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.97	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 651 0101  
 Title URBAN SUSTAINABILITY  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 932  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1649	3.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.95	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.97	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.68	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.20	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.90	4.30	4.37	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.81	4.16	4.49	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.63	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.88	4.42	4.67	5.00	

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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: GES 681 0101  
 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENVI  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 933  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1531/1533	1.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1511/1512	1.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	1.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	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: GES 686 0101  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 934  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1375	3.67	4.38	4.27	4.44	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1366/1384	2.00	3.95	4.08	4.30	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1374/1382	2.00	4.20	4.29	4.52	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1364/1368	1.50	4.25	4.30	4.56	1.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.78	4.16	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 243	4.67	4.54	4.12	4.61	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.73	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.80	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/ 555	4.67	4.65	4.29	4.66	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.97	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.68	4.47	4.50	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	91/ 92	2.00	4.20	4.35	4.42	2.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	2.00	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.60	4.47	4.58	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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