

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	3	20	41	39	4.07	1072/1509	4.19	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	4	15	47	38	4.14	972/1509	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	5	20	32	45	4.06	903/1287	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	63	5	2	12	9	13	3.56	1288/1459	3.90	4.20	4.22	4.11	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	6	6	21	30	38	3.87	956/1406	3.87	3.96	4.09	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	81	2	3	4	8	3	3.35	****/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	2	9	16	73	4.56	387/1489	4.61	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	3	63	35	4.29	1229/1506	4.28	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	4	0	1	18	56	25	4.05	826/1463	4.06	4.18	4.09	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	9	23	71	4.60	675/1438	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	3	9	90	4.82	768/1421	4.84	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	8	35	57	4.42	725/1411	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	12	20	70	4.54	596/1405	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	3	5	15	31	45	4.11	607/1236	4.29	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	94	0	3	0	2	6	4	3.53	****/1260	4.01	4.04	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	95	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	****/1255	4.01	4.35	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	96	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	****/1258	4.43	4.49	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	94	11	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 873	3.58	3.81	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	108	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	108	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	108	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.53	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	108	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	3.96	4.46	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	4.26	4.09	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	108	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	4.17	4.01	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	108	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	3	A	24	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	52						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	9	C	18	General	69	Under-grad	109	Non-major	106
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	16	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				

Course-Section: GES 102 200
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Biehler, Dawn
 Enrollment: 155
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 814
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	3	6	20	29	4.24	901/1509	4.19	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	9	14	33	4.29	828/1509	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	8	15	33	4.34	698/1287	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	26	3	2	4	8	16	3.97	1022/1459	3.90	4.20	4.22	4.11	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	3	7	10	13	19	3.73	1060/1406	3.87	3.96	4.09	4.02	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	42	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	557/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	12	43	4.67	265/1489	4.61	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	38	19	4.33	1205/1506	4.28	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	1	9	23	12	4.02	842/1463	4.06	4.18	4.09	4.02	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	8	47	4.82	334/1438	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	5	49	4.87	614/1421	4.84	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	4	11	39	4.60	496/1411	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	12	38	4.52	624/1405	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	2	7	12	31	4.32	431/1236	4.29	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	3	1	4	8	16	4.03	735/1260	4.01	4.04	4.14	3.95	4.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	2	8	4	17	4.06	886/1255	4.01	4.35	4.33	4.15	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	1	4	5	22	4.50	620/1258	4.43	4.49	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	30	14	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	688/ 873	3.58	3.81	4.03	3.89	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.72	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.42	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	3.96	4.46	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	4.26	4.09	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	4.17	4.01	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: GES 102 200
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Biehler, Dawn
 Enrollment: 155
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 814
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	2	B	17						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	20	Under-grad	62	Non-major	59
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	9	31	45	4.26	882/1509	4.19	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	7	27	51	4.36	753/1509	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	6	8	20	55	4.39	648/1287	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	40	1	5	5	12	26	4.16	860/1459	3.90	4.20	4.22	4.11	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	5	7	10	21	40	4.01	805/1406	3.87	3.96	4.09	4.02	4.01
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	61	3	2	4	5	14	3.89	946/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	4	2	19	63	4.60	341/1489	4.61	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	65	20	4.21	1295/1506	4.28	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	3	0	6	40	23	4.11	786/1463	4.06	4.18	4.09	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	15	72	4.78	413/1438	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	11	76	4.84	691/1421	4.84	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	7	19	58	4.55	568/1411	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	1	13	65	4.56	587/1405	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	2	6	23	52	4.42	338/1236	4.29	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	3	4	9	17	25	3.98	770/1260	4.01	4.04	4.14	3.95	3.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	5	3	10	11	29	3.97	939/1255	4.01	4.35	4.33	4.15	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	3	6	12	36	4.36	749/1258	4.43	4.49	4.38	4.18	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	33	33	2	4	4	7	8	3.60	671/ 873	3.58	3.81	4.03	3.89	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.72	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.42	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	87	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	87	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	3	0	5	5	13	3.96	32/ 49	3.96	4.46	4.26	4.28	3.96
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	3	1	0	3	7	12	4.26	14/ 41	4.26	4.09	4.14	4.13	4.26
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	2	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	29/ 46	4.17	4.01	4.31	4.52	4.17
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	10	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	67	13	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: GES 102 300
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Neff, Robert
 Enrollment: 148
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 815
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	5	A	25	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	39						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	56	Under-grad	91	Non-major	90
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GES 110 100
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Lewis,Laurajean
 Enrollment: 133
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 816
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	3	16	24	28	4.00	1114/1509	4.14	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	12	26	33	4.21	912/1509	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	8	15	44	4.32	728/1287	4.33	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	3	1	10	11	28	4.13	885/1459	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	4	3	11	24	26	3.96	873/1406	3.77	3.96	4.09	4.02	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	41	2	1	9	8	13	3.88	962/1384	3.88	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	5	22	44	4.47	513/1489	4.55	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	65	4.85	702/1506	4.95	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	0	3	10	30	8	3.84	1029/1463	3.98	4.18	4.09	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	5	12	52	4.61	675/1438	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	11	57	4.72	933/1421	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	8	23	37	4.32	820/1411	4.44	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	5	19	44	4.40	758/1405	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	5	8	15	42	4.34	412/1236	4.41	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	7	4	12	8	14	3.40	1091/1260	3.66	4.04	4.14	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	5	7	8	10	16	3.54	1117/1255	4.18	4.35	4.33	4.15	3.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	2	6	6	16	15	3.80	1054/1258	4.10	4.49	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	29	6	4	1	11	13	11	3.65	653/ 873	3.65	3.81	4.03	3.89	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.72	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	68	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 165	****	4.42	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: GES 110 100
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Lewis, Laurajean
 Enrollment: 133
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 816
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	A	29	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	31	Under-grad	75	Non-major	73
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 110 200
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom
 Enrollment: 132
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 817
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	3	19	17	36	4.03	1100/1509	4.14	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	15	19	40	4.25	870/1509	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	4	10	18	43	4.21	820/1287	4.33	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	58	0	1	6	6	8	4.00	979/1459	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	59	3	2	7	4	4	3.20	1299/1406	3.77	3.96	4.09	4.02	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	77	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1384	3.88	4.17	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	16	55	4.56	399/1489	4.55	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	77	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.76	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	1	19	27	22	3.93	957/1463	3.98	4.18	4.09	4.02	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	13	64	4.78	396/1438	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	77	4.96	215/1421	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	11	15	51	4.47	653/1411	4.44	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	7	16	53	4.49	646/1405	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	4	13	15	43	4.25	489/1236	4.41	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	2	12	14	22	4.06	729/1260	3.66	4.04	4.14	3.95	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	4	13	33	4.58	519/1255	4.18	4.35	4.33	4.15	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	2	6	11	30	4.41	721/1258	4.10	4.49	4.38	4.18	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	31	40	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	****/ 873	3.65	3.81	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	78	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	76	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	76	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	76	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	76	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	76	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: GES 110 200
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Rabenhorst, Thom
 Enrollment: 132
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 817
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	22	General	43	Under-grad	80	Non-major	79
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	15	34	4.40	724/1509	4.14	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	11	38	4.51	543/1509	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	13	37	4.46	566/1287	4.33	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	40	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	421/1459	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.11	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	1	6	6	16	4.17	683/1406	3.77	3.96	4.09	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	46	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/1384	3.88	4.17	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	5	44	4.64	308/1489	4.55	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	56	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.76	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	0	5	24	12	4.17	714/1463	3.98	4.18	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	50	4.88	262/1438	4.76	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	52	4.91	483/1421	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	13	36	4.51	617/1411	4.44	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	9	43	4.65	473/1405	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	3	8	39	4.65	187/1236	4.41	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	4	3	10	5	12	3.53	1038/1260	3.66	4.04	4.14	3.95	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	2	2	6	23	4.41	656/1255	4.18	4.35	4.33	4.15	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	10	4	18	4.09	907/1258	4.10	4.49	4.38	4.18	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	23	25	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	****/ 873	3.65	3.81	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 17			
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C 10	General 21	Under-grad 57	Non-major 57
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: GES 120 1
 Title Env Science/Conservati
 Instructor: Ellis,Erle C
 Enrollment: 135
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 819
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	10	21	37	4.40	734/1509	4.40	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	6	23	38	4.48	589/1509	4.48	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	27	37	4.48	554/1287	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	1	11	16	28	4.27	759/1459	4.27	4.20	4.22	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	11	18	35	4.22	623/1406	4.22	3.96	4.09	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	1	2	7	22	21	4.13	726/1384	4.13	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	12	20	33	4.29	728/1489	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	66	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	5	32	21	4.28	608/1463	4.28	4.18	4.09	4.02	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	11	55	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	62	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	19	43	4.64	442/1411	4.64	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	17	47	4.68	432/1405	4.68	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	2	21	41	4.55	242/1236	4.55	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	5	13	20	4.31	582/1260	4.31	4.04	4.14	3.95	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	1	11	26	4.56	533/1255	4.56	4.35	4.33	4.15	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	1	0	8	29	4.62	542/1258	4.62	4.49	4.38	4.18	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	31	12	3	4	7	5	8	3.41	738/ 873	3.41	3.81	4.03	3.89	3.41
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.72	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.42	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	67	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	67	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: GES 120 1
 Title Env Science/Conservati
 Instructor: Ellis,Erle C
 Enrollment: 135
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 819
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	35						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	27	Under-grad	70	Non-major	68
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1509	4.93	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	150/1509	4.87	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	421/1459	4.54	4.20	4.22	4.30	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1406	****	3.96	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	440/1384	4.40	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	513/1489	4.47	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	870/1506	4.73	4.76	4.67	4.61	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	190/1463	4.70	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1411	4.92	4.41	4.31	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1405	4.92	4.39	4.32	4.39	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	223/1236	4.58	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.04	4.14	4.19	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.49	4.38	4.44	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	3.81	4.03	4.04	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.72	4.16	4.54	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	20/ 198	4.90	4.44	4.22	4.51	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.82	4.48	4.62	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.63	4.36	4.65	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	4.42	4.18	4.56	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GES 286 1
 Title Expl Env: Geo-Spat Vie
 Instructor: School, Joseph
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 821
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	528/1509	4.57	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	942/1509	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	9	7	3.78	1081/1287	3.78	4.27	4.20	4.30	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	5	11	3.96	1033/1459	3.96	4.20	4.22	4.30	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1140/1406	3.60	3.96	4.09	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	1	16	4.35	663/1489	4.35	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	10	5	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1005/1411	4.09	4.41	4.31	4.37	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	10	4.05	1028/1405	4.05	4.39	4.32	4.39	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	402/1236	4.35	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1142/1260	3.14	4.04	4.14	4.19	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	974/1255	3.93	4.35	4.33	4.37	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.49	4.38	4.44	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.81	4.03	4.04	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	101/ 184	4.13	4.72	4.16	4.54	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	158/ 198	3.80	4.44	4.22	4.51	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	77/ 184	4.67	4.82	4.48	4.62	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	145/ 177	3.93	4.63	4.36	4.65	3.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	80/ 165	4.27	4.42	4.18	4.56	4.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	23/ 48	4.63	4.01	4.39	4.79	4.63
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	32/ 48	4.25	4.10	4.41	4.50	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	23/ 47	4.75	4.18	4.51	4.83	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	29/ 47	4.00	3.96	4.18	4.56	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: GES 286 1
 Title Expl Env: Geo-Spat Vie
 Instructor: School, Joseph
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 821
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	15	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 302 1
 Title Selected Topics In Geo
 Instructor: Lansing,David
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 822
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	12	11	4.36	767/1509	4.36	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	10	7	3.84	1202/1509	3.84	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	12	10	4.20	834/1459	4.20	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	762/1384	4.08	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	630/1489	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	11	3	3.76	1092/1463	3.76	4.18	4.09	4.08	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	677/1411	4.46	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	392/1236	4.36	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	258/1260	4.73	4.04	4.14	4.22	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	0	6	7	4.07	886/1255	4.07	4.35	4.33	4.37	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	598/1258	4.53	4.49	4.38	4.42	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	427/ 873	4.07	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	6
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GES 308 1
 Title Ecology
 Instructor: Swan,Christophe
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 823
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	13	27	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	31	4.65	367/1509	4.65	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	31	4.72	293/1287	4.72	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	218/1459	4.73	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	29	4.65	231/1406	4.65	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	685/1384	4.18	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	10	30	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	175/1506	4.98	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	1	3	16	15	4.29	598/1463	4.29	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	38	4.84	319/1438	4.84	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	8	34	4.72	933/1421	4.72	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	18	23	4.47	665/1411	4.47	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	9	25	4.19	947/1405	4.19	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	3	4	7	18	4.06	640/1236	4.06	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1038/1260	3.53	4.04	4.14	4.22	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1047/1255	3.78	4.35	4.33	4.37	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	980/1258	3.94	4.49	4.38	4.42	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	26	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	38
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 311 1
 Title Weather And Climate
 Instructor: Tokay, Ali
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 824
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	528/1509	4.57	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	589/1509	4.48	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	15	4.35	698/1287	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	536/1459	4.45	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	1	4	2	6	3.29	1270/1406	3.29	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	466/1384	4.38	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	387/1489	4.57	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	949/1506	4.65	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	367/1463	4.48	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	549/1405	4.59	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.04	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.35	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	742/1258	4.38	4.49	4.38	4.42	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.72	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.42	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: GES 311 1
 Title Weather And Climate
 Instructor: Tokay, Ali
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 824
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 313 1
 Title Biogeography
 Instructor: Lewis,Laurajean
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 825
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	20	4.43	698/1509	4.43	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	22	4.51	531/1509	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	29	4.77	240/1287	4.77	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	18	4.29	737/1459	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	3	14	13	4.12	720/1406	4.12	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	11	13	3.94	886/1384	3.94	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	29	4.77	175/1489	4.77	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	820/1506	4.77	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	16	12	4.22	668/1463	4.22	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	24	4.70	545/1438	4.70	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	742/1421	4.82	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	9	21	4.44	689/1411	4.44	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	9	20	4.38	778/1405	4.38	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	10	19	4.41	354/1236	4.41	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/1260	****	4.04	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/1255	****	4.35	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1258	****	4.49	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 35	Non-major 27
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 1	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GES 329 1
 Title Geog Of Disease & Heal
 Instructor: Biehler,Dawn
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 826
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	227/1509	4.83	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	184/1509	4.83	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	218/1287	4.79	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	291/1459	4.66	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	238/1406	4.64	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	139/1489	4.82	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	184/1463	4.71	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	153/1438	4.93	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	148/1411	4.90	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	217/1405	4.86	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	126/1236	4.76	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	109/1260	4.93	4.04	4.14	4.22	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.35	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	130/ 873	4.71	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 29 Non-major 21
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: GES 330 1
 Title Geog Of Econ Developme
 Instructor: Bennett,Sari J
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 827
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	0	0	1	0	9	19	4.59	505/1509	4.59	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	13	12	4.28	838/1509	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	9	15	4.28	763/1287	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	13	9	4.03	958/1459	4.03	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	9	16	4.39	454/1406	4.39	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	13	10	4.15	718/1384	4.15	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	9	16	4.39	608/1489	4.39	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	18	4.64	957/1506	4.64	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	618/1463	4.27	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	574/1438	4.68	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	496/1411	4.61	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	309/1405	4.79	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	9	17	4.52	267/1236	4.52	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.04	4.14	4.22	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	740/1255	4.31	4.35	4.33	4.37	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	165/1258	4.94	4.49	4.38	4.42	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	15	13	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GES 381 1
 Title Remote Sensing
 Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 828
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	8	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	6	7	3.75	1091/1287	3.75	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	7	7	3.84	1135/1459	3.84	4.20	4.22	4.26	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1307/1406	3.17	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	2	6	6	3.72	1069/1384	3.72	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	3	3	10	3.80	1176/1489	3.80	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1262/1463	3.47	4.18	4.09	4.08	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	981/1438	4.35	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	991/1421	4.68	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	920/1411	4.21	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	9	4.05	1024/1405	4.05	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	474/1236	4.28	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	892/1260	3.85	4.04	4.14	4.22	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	5	1	7	4.15	845/1255	4.15	4.35	4.33	4.37	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	873/1258	4.15	4.49	4.38	4.42	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.72	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.44	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.42	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	5.00	****

Course-Section: GES 381 1
 Title Remote Sensing
 Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 828
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	17	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 386 1
 Title Intro Geog Info System
 Instructor: School, Joseph
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 829
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	422/1509	4.65	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	688/1287	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	4	12	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4	3	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	579/1384	4.29	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	786/1463	4.12	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.63	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	789/1411	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	137/1236	4.74	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	892/1260	3.85	4.04	4.14	4.22	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1019/1255	3.85	4.35	4.33	4.37	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	873/1258	4.15	4.49	4.38	4.42	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	26/ 184	4.78	4.72	4.16	4.07	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	83/ 198	4.33	4.44	4.22	4.17	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.82	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	41/ 177	4.78	4.63	4.36	4.30	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	41/ 165	4.63	4.42	4.18	4.11	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.37	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.30	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.97	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	3.65	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.96	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.10	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: GES 386 1
 Title Intro Geog Info System
 Instructor: School, Joseph
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 829
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	5	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	327/1509	4.87	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1170/1509	4.07	4.25	4.26	4.26	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1025/1287	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.38	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1088/1459	4.45	4.20	4.22	4.32	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	1122/1406	3.94	3.96	4.09	4.11	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1384	4.67	4.17	4.11	4.23	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	5	6	3	3.37	1352/1489	2.93	4.07	4.17	4.18	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	870/1506	4.87	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	438/1463	4.59	4.18	4.09	4.18	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	904/1438	4.46	4.63	4.46	4.50	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	322/1421	4.97	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	911/1411	4.24	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	848/1405	4.41	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	893/1236	4.22	4.22	4.00	4.03	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1045/1260	4.25	4.04	4.14	4.25	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	839/1255	4.58	4.35	4.33	4.46	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	932/1258	4.25	4.49	4.38	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 184	5.00	4.72	4.16	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 198	4.00	4.44	4.22	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 184	5.00	4.82	4.48	4.66	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 177	****	4.63	4.36	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	3.00	4.42	4.18	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	19/ 48	4.76	4.01	4.39	4.75	4.76	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	41/ 48	3.88	4.10	4.41	4.54	3.88	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	5	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	37/ 47	4.08	4.18	4.51	4.51	4.08	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	4	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	38/ 47	3.69	3.96	4.18	4.19	3.69	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	12	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	28/ 44	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.07	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 1	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 4			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	4.87	4.36	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1509	4.07	4.25	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	4.45	4.20	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	3.94	3.96	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.93	4.07	4.17	4.18	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.87	4.76	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.59	4.18	4.09	4.18	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	800/1438	4.46	4.63	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	885/1411	4.24	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.41	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.22	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.25	4.04	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	4.58	4.35	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	620/1258	4.25	4.49	4.38	4.51	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.72	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.44	4.22	4.37	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.82	4.48	4.66	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.00	4.42	4.18	4.29	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 411 1
 Title Fluvial Morphology
 Instructor: Miller, Andrew J
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 832
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.26	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	200/1406	4.70	3.96	4.09	4.11	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	954/1384	3.89	4.17	4.11	4.23	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.18	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	545/1438	4.70	4.63	4.46	4.50	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	841/1411	4.30	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	4.04	4.14	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1167/1255	3.33	4.35	4.33	4.46	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.67	4.49	4.38	4.51	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.01	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.10	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.18	4.51	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 434 1
 Title Wldlf Law & End Spec A
 Instructor: Parker, Eugene P
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 833
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	95/1509	4.95	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	519/1509	4.53	4.25	4.26	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1287	4.63	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	218/1459	4.72	4.20	4.22	4.32	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	99/1406	4.89	3.96	4.09	4.11	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	313/1384	4.56	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	175/1489	4.78	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1280/1506	4.22	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.18	4.09	4.18	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.63	4.46	4.50	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	456/1411	4.63	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	103/1405	4.95	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	984/1236	3.50	4.22	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1260	4.58	4.04	4.14	4.25	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.35	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.49	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	91/ 873	4.82	3.81	4.03	4.26	4.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 1 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 18 Non-major 12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: GES 462 1
 Title Human-Environment Gis
 Instructor: Neff,Robert
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 834
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.20	4.22	4.32	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.96	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.18	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.22	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.04	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.35	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.51	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.72	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.44	4.22	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.82	4.48	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.63	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	4.42	4.18	4.29	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 4	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GES 601 1
 Title Intro To Ges
 Instructor: Neff,Robert (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 835
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1214/1489	3.71	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1036/1463	3.92	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1135/1438	4.25	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.86	4.73	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1163/1405	3.83	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1021/1236	3.43	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.04	4.14	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.35	4.33	4.43	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.49	4.38	4.50	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	771/ 873	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	64/ 89	4.17	4.37	4.49	4.39	4.17
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	71/ 92	4.17	4.30	4.54	4.52	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	86/ 90	3.50	3.97	4.50	4.48	3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.30	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	79/ 93	3.00	3.65	4.06	4.04	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	19/ 49	4.60	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.60
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	35/ 41	3.75	4.09	4.14	4.08	3.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	38/ 46	3.60	4.01	4.31	4.11	3.60
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	29/ 37	3.50	3.80	4.05	3.69	3.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 601 1
 Title Intro To Ges
 Instructor: Halverson, Jeffr (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 836
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1214/1489	3.71	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	853/1463	3.92	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1001/1438	4.25	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.86	4.73	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1163/1405	3.83	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1021/1236	3.43	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.04	4.14	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.35	4.33	4.43	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.49	4.38	4.50	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	771/ 873	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	64/ 89	4.17	4.37	4.49	4.39	4.17
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	71/ 92	4.17	4.30	4.54	4.52	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	86/ 90	3.50	3.97	4.50	4.48	3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.30	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	79/ 93	3.00	3.65	4.06	4.04	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	19/ 49	4.60	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.60
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	35/ 41	3.75	4.09	4.14	4.08	3.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	38/ 46	3.60	4.01	4.31	4.11	3.60
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	29/ 37	3.50	3.80	4.05	3.69	3.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 621 1
 Title Water/Urban Environmen
 Instructor: Miller, Andrew J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 837
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1283/1509	3.71	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1127/1459	3.86	4.20	4.22	4.16	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1151/1406	3.57	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	726/1463	3.83	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	514/1438	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	858/1411	4.14	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	733/1405	4.29	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.04	4.14	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.35	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: GES 621 1
 Title Water/Urban Environmen
 Instructor: Brennan,Timothy (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 838
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1283/1509	3.71	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1127/1459	3.86	4.20	4.22	4.16	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1151/1406	3.57	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.83	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	712/1438	4.64	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.14	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	974/1405	4.29	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.04	4.14	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.35	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: GES 622 1
 Title Res Design/Urban Env
 Instructor: Miller, Andrew J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 839
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1399/1509	3.50	4.36	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	860/1459	4.17	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	683/1406	4.17	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.50	4.07	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	853/1463	3.90	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.75	4.86	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1051/1411	3.92	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1163/1405	3.83	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	809/1236	3.83	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: GES 622 1
 Title Res Design/Urban Env
 Instructor: McConnell, Virgi (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 840
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1399/1509	3.50	4.36	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	860/1459	4.17	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	683/1406	4.17	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.50	4.07	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1060/1463	3.90	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.75	4.86	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1174/1411	3.92	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1163/1405	3.83	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	809/1236	3.83	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.04	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: GES 662 101
 Title Human Environment GIS
 Instructor: Neff,Robert
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 841
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.18	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1257/1260	2.00	4.04	4.14	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.49	4.38	4.50	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 671 101
 Title Spatial Database I
 Instructor: Evans,Owen J
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 842
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1509	****	4.36	4.31	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1509	****	4.25	4.26	4.25	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1459	****	4.20	4.22	4.16	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1406	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1384	****	4.17	4.11	4.16	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.07	4.17	4.14	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	****	4.76	4.67	4.71	****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1463	****	4.18	4.09	4.15	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	****	4.63	4.46	4.49	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.86	4.73	4.78	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	****	4.39	4.32	4.33	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.22	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1260	****	4.04	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.35	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.49	4.38	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	133/1509	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	127/1287	4.90	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	335/1459	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	909/1406	3.93	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	505/1384	4.35	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	330/1489	4.61	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	452/1463	4.42	4.18	4.09	4.15	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	497/1438	4.72	4.63	4.46	4.49	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.86	4.73	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	486/1405	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	261/1236	4.53	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	0	8	3.92	844/1260	3.92	4.04	4.14	4.21	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	974/1255	3.92	4.35	4.33	4.43	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	996/1258	3.92	4.49	4.38	4.50	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	14/ 184	4.90	4.72	4.16	4.07	4.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	26/ 198	4.82	4.44	4.22	4.31	4.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	39/ 184	4.82	4.82	4.48	4.11	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 177	4.80	4.63	4.36	4.41	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	23/ 165	4.82	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	32/ 89	4.89	4.37	4.49	4.39	4.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	54/ 92	4.63	4.30	4.54	4.52	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 90	4.88	3.97	4.50	4.48	4.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	62/ 92	4.33	4.33	4.38	4.30	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	44/ 93	4.33	3.65	4.06	4.04	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	44/ 48	3.67	4.01	4.39	4.36	3.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	26/ 48	4.50	4.10	4.41	4.40	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	32/ 47	4.40	4.18	4.51	4.43	4.40
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	26/ 47	4.40	3.96	4.18	4.03	4.40
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	19/ 44	4.60	4.10	4.32	4.45	4.60
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	16/ 49	4.67	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	11/ 41	4.60	4.09	4.14	4.08	4.60
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	22/ 46	4.67	4.01	4.31	4.11	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	19/ 37	4.40	3.80	4.05	3.69	4.40
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	16/ 30	4.00	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.00

Course-Section: GES 675 1
 Title GIS Application Develo
 Instructor: Yang, Xiuzhu
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 843
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 678 1
 Title GIS Project Management
 Instructor: Schlee, John W
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 844
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	9	3	0	3.00	1473/1509	3.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	2	2	3.13	1452/1509	3.13	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1101/1287	3.73	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	2	6	1	3.14	1405/1459	3.14	4.20	4.22	4.16	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	575/1406	4.27	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	4	1	3.21	1294/1384	3.21	4.17	4.11	4.16	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	7	2	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	3.60	1480/1506	3.60	4.76	4.67	4.71	3.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	5	4	0	3.08	1383/1463	3.08	4.18	4.09	4.15	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	5	5	1	3.00	1406/1438	3.00	4.63	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1361/1421	3.93	4.86	4.73	4.78	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	8	4	2	3.47	1289/1411	3.47	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	4	2	3.07	1343/1405	3.07	4.39	4.32	4.33	3.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	3	3	4	1	2.92	1157/1236	2.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1081/1260	3.43	4.04	4.14	4.21	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	6	6	2	3.71	1067/1255	3.71	4.35	4.33	4.43	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.49	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	780/ 873	3.20	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	84/ 184	4.25	4.72	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	94/ 198	4.25	4.44	4.22	4.31	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	141/ 184	4.25	4.82	4.48	4.11	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	120/ 177	4.25	4.63	4.36	4.41	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	81/ 165	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	62/ 89	4.25	4.37	4.49	4.39	4.25
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	68/ 92	4.25	4.30	4.54	4.52	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	69/ 90	4.00	3.97	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.33	4.38	4.30	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	47/ 93	4.25	3.65	4.06	4.04	4.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	46/ 48	3.00	4.01	4.39	4.36	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	43/ 48	3.75	4.10	4.41	4.40	3.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	44/ 47	3.50	4.18	4.51	4.43	3.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	37/ 47	3.75	3.96	4.18	4.03	3.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	40/ 44	3.50	4.10	4.32	4.45	3.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.46	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 41	****	4.09	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.01	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: GES 678 1
 Title GIS Project Management
 Instructor: Schlee, John W
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 844
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	7	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						