

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	139
Questionnaires:	100

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	0	4	12	34	48	4.29	886/1528	4.16	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	30	54	4.37	783/1527	4.24	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	13	32	50	4.32	787/1333	4.31	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	2	7	17	32	34	3.97	1091/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.11	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	20	36	35	4.01	845/1439	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.97	4.01
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	6	16	42	27	3.80	1056/1425	3.83	4.10	4.12	3.93	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	21	71	4.65	295/1508	4.47	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	61	36	4.36	1201/1526	4.54	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	10	60	19	4.10	845/1490	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.02	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	14	81	4.78	441/1428	4.69	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	11	86	4.89	580/1436	4.85	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	29	62	4.57	553/1427	4.47	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	24	70	4.67	462/1425	4.59	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	12	25	56	4.41	415/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	93	0	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	****/1271	3.90	4.14	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	93	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	****/1276	3.90	4.32	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	****/1273	4.38	4.43	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	93	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/922	3.44	3.77	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	139
Title:	Human Geography		Questionnaires:	100
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	99	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	98	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	98	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	99	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	99	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	3.93	4.28	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	4.40	4.60	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	99	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	3.76	4.17	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	139
Questionnaires:	100

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	3.50	4.44	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	99	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	3.55	4.32	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	24	0.00-0.99	4	A	20	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	50						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	15	General	73	Under-grad	100	Non-major	96
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	82

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	9	7	30	34	4.07	1096/1528	4.16	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	29	40	4.27	882/1527	4.24	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	20	53	4.51	564/1333	4.31	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	4	10	34	29	4.06	1020/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	11	5	9	18	35	3.78	1037/1439	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.97	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	4	16	23	32	3.88	1000/1425	3.83	4.10	4.12	3.93	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	28	45	4.41	572/1508	4.47	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	18	61	4.77	783/1526	4.54	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	1	2	12	28	18	3.98	938/1490	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.02	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	5	73	4.90	237/1428	4.69	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	74	4.94	361/1436	4.85	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	13	61	4.70	378/1427	4.47	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	11	61	4.65	489/1425	4.59	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	2	5	17	50	4.51	327/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	3	8	12	10	3.79	939/1271	3.90	4.14	4.16	3.98	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	3	2	8	11	11	3.71	1080/1276	3.90	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	1	0	2	13	17	4.36	754/1273	4.38	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	49	11	1	3	6	4	8	3.68	648/922	3.44	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.68

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	82

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	80	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/43	3.93	4.28	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	4.40	4.60	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	3.76	4.17	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	82

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	3.50	4.44	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	3.55	4.32	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	25	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	9	General	49	Under-grad	82	Non-major	80
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	17						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 300
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	147
Questionnaires:	78

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	12	31	32	4.17	1015/1528	4.16	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	13	25	37	4.22	942/1527	4.24	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	12	20	38	4.12	943/1333	4.31	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	12	28	32	4.13	972/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	5	9	25	30	3.99	873/1439	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.97	3.99
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	15	27	28	3.97	916/1425	3.83	4.10	4.12	3.93	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	25	46	4.53	428/1508	4.47	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	63	12	4.10	1393/1526	4.54	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	12	37	13	4.02	904/1490	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.02	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	15	59	4.71	553/1428	4.69	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	9	65	4.83	774/1436	4.85	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	26	43	4.42	757/1427	4.47	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	28	46	4.55	622/1425	4.59	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	5	8	21	39	4.24	546/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	3	2	8	15	18	3.93	840/1271	3.90	4.14	4.16	3.98	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	2	1	9	12	21	4.09	897/1276	3.90	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	2	4	11	28	4.44	689/1273	4.38	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	33	29	1	6	3	4	2	3.00	****/922	3.44	3.77	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 300
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	147
Questionnaires:	78

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	9	7	10	3.93	34/43	3.93	4.28	4.43	4.68	3.93
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	3	1	0	3	5	16	4.40	23/31	4.40	4.60	4.53	4.51	4.40
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	7	1	2	5	6	7	3.76	29/36	3.76	4.17	4.43	4.33	3.76
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	8	2	1	7	5	5	3.50	19/21	3.50	4.44	4.54	4.63	3.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	8	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	18/20	3.55	4.32	4.45	4.39	3.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3 A 23	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1 B 32						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3 C 16	General	47	Under-grad	78	Non-major	77

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 300
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	147
Questionnaires:	78

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

84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives			10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	6									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 400
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	156
Questionnaires:	93

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	16	31	40	4.12	1067/1528	4.16	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	18	33	38	4.11	1044/1527	4.24	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	13	28	48	4.29	803/1333	4.31	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	10	16	36	26	3.76	1240/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.11	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	8	16	18	21	26	3.46	1237/1439	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.97	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	9	27	25	27	3.67	1134/1425	3.83	4.10	4.12	3.93	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	11	24	51	4.30	722/1508	4.47	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	88	4.95	340/1526	4.54	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	3	13	29	28	4.12	822/1490	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.02	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	11	28	50	4.38	981/1428	4.69	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	16	71	4.74	933/1436	4.85	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	12	33	39	4.20	959/1427	4.47	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	4	4	23	57	4.47	711/1425	4.59	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	4	4	6	27	48	4.25	546/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	4	9	15	25	3.98	797/1271	3.90	4.14	4.16	3.98	3.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	4	4	7	21	21	3.89	998/1276	3.90	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	2	1	5	17	32	4.33	776/1273	4.38	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	37	20	6	4	9	11	6	3.19	825/922	3.44	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 400
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	156
Questionnaires:	93

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	90	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	90	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	90	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	90	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	90	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	92	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	3.93	4.28	4.43	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	6	A	27	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	40						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	15	General	56	Under-grad	92	Non-major	92
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 102 400	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 156
Title: Human Geography		Questionnaires: 93
Instructor: Lansing, David		

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

	P	0		to be significant
	I	0	Other	0
	?	9		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 100
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	132
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	4	5	21	23	4.07	1096/1528	4.23	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	15	30	4.22	942/1527	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	3	10	34	4.34	769/1333	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	28	2	2	2	8	12	4.00	1047/1495	4.19	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	3	7	17	19	3.94	929/1439	3.83	4.09	4.11	3.97	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	37	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1082/1425	3.76	4.10	4.12	3.93	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	5	8	37	4.47	489/1508	4.62	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	6	46	4.85	671/1526	4.92	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	3	2	18	20	4.20	734/1490	4.17	4.01	4.11	4.02	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	10	40	4.66	637/1428	4.83	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	47	4.87	645/1436	4.92	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	13	34	4.49	639/1427	4.60	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	7	39	4.51	667/1425	4.62	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	3	5	14	28	4.34	472/1291	4.52	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	0	4	5	12	4.09	756/1271	4.07	4.14	4.16	3.98	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	2	1	6	6	9	3.79	1044/1276	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	3	9	11	4.21	857/1273	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	32	10	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 100
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	132
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 110 100	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 132
Title: Physical Geography		Questionnaires: 55
Instructor: Baker,Matthew E		

	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	13	General	28	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	147
Questionnaires:	79

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	0	4	5	22	46	4.43	739/1528	4.23	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	17	52	4.56	514/1527	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	17	57	4.69	372/1333	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	49	1	1	1	8	17	4.39	669/1495	4.19	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	2	4	12	18	27	4.02	845/1439	3.83	4.09	4.11	3.97	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	60	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	****/1425	3.76	4.10	4.12	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	13	62	4.75	191/1508	4.62	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	2	73	4.97	170/1526	4.92	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	1	0	8	31	24	4.20	734/1490	4.17	4.01	4.11	4.02	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	70	4.92	177/1428	4.83	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	74	4.97	155/1436	4.92	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	11	59	4.77	283/1427	4.60	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	10	65	4.87	208/1425	4.62	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	1	10	62	4.78	124/1291	4.52	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	3	6	7	25	4.16	701/1271	4.07	4.14	4.16	3.98	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	4	5	34	4.70	406/1276	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	6	11	25	4.45	680/1273	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	36	30	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	147
Questionnaires:	79

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	78	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	4	A	27	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	28						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	12	General	34	Under-grad	79	Non-major	72
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	2	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 300
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	102
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	2	8	16	28	4.18	1004/1528	4.23	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	17	32	4.41	720/1527	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	7	40	4.45	648/1333	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	38	2	0	2	3	11	4.17	942/1495	4.19	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	7	13	11	12	3.53	1197/1439	3.83	4.09	4.11	3.97	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	49	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	****/1425	3.76	4.10	4.12	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	9	42	4.63	329/1508	4.62	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	53	4.94	340/1526	4.92	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	3	4	21	18	4.11	845/1490	4.17	4.01	4.11	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	51	4.91	221/1428	4.83	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	52	4.93	413/1436	4.92	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	15	36	4.55	577/1427	4.60	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	11	39	4.48	696/1425	4.62	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	5	15	34	4.45	385/1291	4.52	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	7	16	11	3.97	806/1271	4.07	4.14	4.16	3.98	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	348/1276	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	584/1273	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	20	30	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 300
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	102
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 300
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	102
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	31	Under-grad	55	Non-major	54
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 1
Title:	Env Science/Conservation
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	154
Questionnaires:	59

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	24	25	4.19	994/1528	4.19	4.34	4.31	4.16	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	14	31	4.25	902/1527	4.25	4.28	4.28	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	15	31	4.22	849/1333	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	0	7	16	24	4.22	879/1495	4.22	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	7	16	31	4.30	615/1439	4.30	4.09	4.11	3.97	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	5	7	13	11	3.76	1088/1425	3.76	4.10	4.12	3.93	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	7	15	31	4.20	845/1508	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	1	54	4.95	340/1526	4.95	4.80	4.66	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	10	31	7	3.94	1005/1490	3.94	4.01	4.11	4.02	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	52	4.86	286/1428	4.86	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	58	4.97	207/1436	4.97	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	17	38	4.58	541/1427	4.58	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	13	36	4.36	846/1425	4.36	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	6	13	35	4.49	336/1291	4.49	4.21	4.05	3.97	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	3	0	7	8	13	3.90	867/1271	3.90	4.14	4.16	3.98	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	2	2	0	8	19	4.29	780/1276	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	1	4	6	19	4.32	784/1273	4.32	4.43	4.38	4.18	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	28	11	5	2	5	4	4	3.00	857/922	3.00	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 1
Title:	Env Science/Conservation
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	154
Questionnaires:	59

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	20	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 220 1
Title:	Env Sci Lab & Field Tech
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	765/1528	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	737/1527	4.41	4.28	4.28	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	624/1495	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	907/1439	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	553/1425	4.36	4.10	4.12	4.11	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	283/1526	4.95	4.80	4.66	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	722/1490	4.21	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	898/1428	4.46	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	709/1436	4.85	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	683/1427	4.46	4.38	4.32	4.33	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	633/1425	4.54	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	415/1291	4.42	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1271	****	4.14	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1276	****	4.32	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1273	****	4.43	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 220 1
Title:	Env Sci Lab & Field Tech
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	24/198	4.72	4.52	4.16	4.41	4.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	23/208	4.83	4.44	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	35/194	4.89	4.43	4.56	4.57	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	26/194	4.83	4.50	4.37	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	59/176	4.50	4.47	4.23	4.18	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	20 Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 23 Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View
Instructor:	School,Joseph

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	11	24	4.46	687/1528	4.46	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	15	17	4.26	892/1527	4.26	4.28	4.28	4.32	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	11	11	14	3.92	1070/1333	3.92	4.30	4.34	4.40	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	6	10	19	4.28	820/1495	4.28	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	28	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1090/1439	3.73	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	301/1425	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	10	9	16	3.92	1118/1508	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.19	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	21	9	4.11	833/1490	4.11	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	10	26	4.56	782/1428	4.56	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	548/1436	4.90	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	3	13	18	4.10	1041/1427	4.10	4.38	4.32	4.33	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	9	20	4.13	1029/1425	4.13	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	4	8	21	4.19	594/1291	4.19	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	3	3	9	7	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	4.14	4.16	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	3	9	11	4.21	837/1276	4.21	4.32	4.33	4.37	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	3	2	7	11	4.00	947/1273	4.00	4.43	4.38	4.43	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	449/922	4.08	3.77	4.02	4.11	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View
Instructor:	School,Joseph

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	1	7	25	4.47	66/198	4.47	4.52	4.16	4.41	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	3	11	19	4.25	123/208	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	2	1	7	26	4.58	122/194	4.58	4.43	4.56	4.57	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	56/194	4.66	4.50	4.37	4.43	4.66
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	3	6	0	2	8	17	3.91	134/176	3.91	4.47	4.23	4.18	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	22/42	4.43	3.76	4.00	3.68	4.43
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	13/41	4.50	4.31	4.06	3.81	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	18/30	4.77	4.97	4.74	4.50	4.77
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	2	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	11/32	4.58	4.60	4.20	4.32	4.58
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	4	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View
Instructor:	School,Joseph

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 B 16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4 C 12	General	10	Under-grad	39	Non-major	26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 100
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	6	20	4.64	463/1528	4.64	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	15	4.43	704/1527	4.43	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	952/1333	4.10	4.30	4.34	4.34	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	19	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	292/1439	4.61	4.09	4.11	4.13	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	635/1425	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.17	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	352/1508	4.61	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	639/1490	4.28	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	2	21	4.50	854/1428	4.50	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	413/1436	4.93	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	742/1427	4.43	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	502/1425	4.64	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	8	17	4.50	327/1291	4.50	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	204/1271	4.80	4.14	4.16	4.19	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	246/1276	4.85	4.32	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	290/1273	4.85	4.43	4.38	4.40	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	218/922	4.50	3.77	4.02	4.02	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 100
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 305 100
Title:	Landscape Ecology
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	4	7	6	5	3.33	1447/1528	3.33	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	1	9	5	1	2.58	1511/1527	2.58	4.28	4.28	4.27	2.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	8	2	3.17	1296/1333	3.17	4.30	4.34	4.34	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	7	7	4	3.21	1437/1495	3.21	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	7	7	3	3.04	1357/1439	3.04	4.09	4.11	4.13	3.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	9	7	3	3.41	1262/1425	3.41	4.10	4.12	4.17	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	8	7	2	3.00	1422/1508	3.00	4.27	4.18	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	283/1526	4.96	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	6	2	7	4	0	2.47	1462/1490	2.47	4.01	4.11	4.11	2.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	965/1428	4.41	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	1221/1436	4.45	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	6	8	3	3.36	1335/1427	3.36	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	6	2	6	5	3.18	1358/1425	3.18	4.38	4.34	4.34	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	3	3	4	4	2	2.94	1215/1291	2.94	4.21	4.05	4.09	2.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1249/1271	2.38	4.14	4.16	4.19	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1188/1276	3.38	4.32	4.33	4.37	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1251/1273	2.75	4.43	4.38	4.40	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	5	0	0	2.83	881/922	2.83	3.77	4.02	4.02	2.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 305 100
Title:	Landscape Ecology
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	24

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	15	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 5 General	3	Under-grad 24 Non-major 21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 308 100
Title:	Ecology
Instructor:	Lewis,Richard R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	4	10	6	3.83	1270/1528	3.83	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	10	5	3.78	1290/1527	3.78	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	6	3.91	1078/1333	3.91	4.30	4.34	4.34	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1175/1495	3.88	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	3	13	4.19	718/1439	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.13	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1016/1425	3.86	4.10	4.12	4.17	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	428/1508	4.52	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	509/1526	4.91	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	6	7	4	1	2.80	1445/1490	2.80	4.01	4.11	4.11	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	830/1428	4.52	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1398/1436	3.90	4.85	4.74	4.74	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1120/1427	3.95	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	7	6	3.71	1239/1425	3.71	4.38	4.34	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1070/1291	3.47	4.21	4.05	4.09	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1271	****	4.14	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1276	****	4.32	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1273	****	4.43	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 308 100
Title:	Ecology
Instructor:	Lewis,Richard R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	23

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 311 100
Title:	Weather And Climate
Instructor:	Halverson, Jeffr

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	6	5	27	4.49	661/1528	4.49	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	14	16	4.08	1064/1527	4.08	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	15	15	3.95	1053/1333	3.95	4.30	4.34	4.34	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	4	3	10	19	4.14	972/1495	4.14	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	12	11	9	3.55	1184/1439	3.55	4.09	4.11	4.13	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	942/1425	3.94	4.10	4.12	4.17	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	8	22	4.21	845/1508	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	18	4.46	1101/1526	4.46	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	3	12	19	4.31	616/1490	4.31	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	5	29	4.59	758/1428	4.59	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	36	4.87	612/1436	4.87	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	13	22	4.38	792/1427	4.38	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	26	4.44	770/1425	4.44	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	8	25	4.45	385/1291	4.45	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/1271	****	4.14	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/1276	****	4.32	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/1273	****	4.43	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 311 100
Title:	Weather And Climate
Instructor:	Halverson, Jeffr

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 311 100
Title:	Weather And Climate
Instructor:	Halverson, Jeffr

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	24						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	22
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 314 100
Title:	Geography Of Soils
Instructor:	Holifield,Quint

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	9	10	13	4.06	1102/1528	4.06	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	11	15	4.18	970/1527	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	542/1333	4.52	4.30	4.34	4.34	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	844/1495	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	678/1439	4.24	4.09	4.11	4.13	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	1	4	11	7	3.59	1171/1425	3.59	4.10	4.12	4.17	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	2	1	7	18	4.23	808/1508	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	20	8	4.09	1395/1526	4.09	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	627/1490	4.30	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	746/1428	4.59	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	361/1436	4.94	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	11	17	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	22	4.39	822/1425	4.39	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	376/1291	4.45	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	446/1271	4.50	4.14	4.16	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	235/1273	4.90	4.43	4.38	4.40	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 314 100
Title:	Geography Of Soils
Instructor:	Holifield,Quint

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 314 100
Title:	Geography Of Soils
Instructor:	Holifield,Quint

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 29	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	20
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9 F 0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 326 100
Title:	Conservation Thought
Instructor:	Parker, Eugene P

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	4	25	4.80	238/1528	4.80	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	18	4.37	783/1527	4.37	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	22	4.57	500/1333	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.34	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	5	19	4.38	695/1495	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	419/1439	4.47	4.09	4.11	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	20	4.40	513/1425	4.40	4.10	4.12	4.17	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	8	16	4.27	771/1508	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	4	7	17	4.27	663/1490	4.27	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	6	21	4.53	818/1428	4.53	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	742/1436	4.83	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	10	16	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	378/1425	4.73	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	7	4	11	4.04	706/1291	4.04	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	961/1271	3.75	4.14	4.16	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	987/1276	3.92	4.32	4.33	4.37	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	776/1273	4.33	4.43	4.38	4.40	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	815/922	3.25	3.77	4.02	4.02	3.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 326 100
Title:	Conservation Thought
Instructor:	Parker, Eugene P

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.44	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 326 100
Title:	Conservation Thought
Instructor:	Parker, Eugene P

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	23
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	0				
			?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 329 100
Title:	Geog Of Disease & Health
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	265/1528	4.78	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	410/1527	4.64	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	30	4.82	228/1333	4.82	4.30	4.34	4.34	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	24	4.58	407/1495	4.58	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	5	19	4.06	818/1439	4.06	4.09	4.11	4.13	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	21	4.52	386/1425	4.52	4.10	4.12	4.17	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	22	4.45	517/1508	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	396/1526	4.94	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	14	13	4.38	530/1490	4.38	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	29	4.84	319/1428	4.84	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	361/1436	4.93	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	28	4.81	220/1427	4.81	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	277/1425	4.81	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	174/1291	4.71	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	421/1271	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.19	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	633/1276	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.37	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	164/1273	4.93	4.43	4.38	4.40	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	266/922	4.42	3.77	4.02	4.02	4.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 329 100
Title:	Geog Of Disease & Health
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 13	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6 C 2	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	27
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			0 P 0						
			0 I 0	Other	1				
			4 ? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 381 100
Title:	Remote Sensing
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	362/1528	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	737/1527	4.41	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	963/1439	3.91	4.09	4.11	4.13	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	839/1425	4.08	4.10	4.12	4.17	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	220/1508	4.73	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	566/1526	4.91	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	389/1490	4.47	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	221/1428	4.90	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	350/1427	4.71	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	407/1425	4.71	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	136/1291	4.76	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	620/1271	4.30	4.14	4.16	4.19	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	290/1276	4.82	4.32	4.33	4.37	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	534/1273	4.64	4.43	4.38	4.40	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 381 100
Title:	Remote Sensing
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	1	3	13	4.30	103/198	4.30	4.52	4.16	4.26	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	0	0	7	10	4.05	154/208	4.05	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.05
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	112/194	4.63	4.43	4.56	4.59	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	1	2	0	3	12	4.28	136/194	4.28	4.50	4.37	4.37	4.28
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	27/176	4.72	4.47	4.23	4.33	4.72
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 381 100
Title:	Remote Sensing
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
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	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 100	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	26
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems		Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	11	7	4.32	855/1528	4.32	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1257/1527	3.84	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1104/1333	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.34	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	772/1495	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	8	2	3	2.95	1383/1439	2.95	4.09	4.11	4.13	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	9	3	3.69	1130/1425	3.69	4.10	4.12	4.17	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	708/1508	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.17	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	8	7	1	3.41	1308/1490	3.41	4.01	4.11	4.11	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	686/1428	4.63	4.62	4.49	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1078/1436	4.63	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	6	4	6	3.58	1286/1427	3.58	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	5	5	3.37	1333/1425	3.37	4.38	4.34	4.34	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	496/1291	4.32	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1100/1271	3.44	4.14	4.16	4.19	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1003/1276	3.89	4.32	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1122/1273	3.67	4.43	4.38	4.40	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 100
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	18/198	4.80	4.52	4.16	4.26	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	26/208	4.80	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.80	4.43	4.56	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	45/194	4.70	4.50	4.37	4.37	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	16/176	4.88	4.47	4.23	4.33	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 386 100	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intro Geog Info Systems		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Tang,Junmei		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 100
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	4	5	4.17	1015/1528	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1057/1527	4.08	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1078/1333	3.92	4.30	4.34	4.37	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	592/1495	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1216/1439	3.50	4.09	4.11	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1193/1425	3.55	4.10	4.12	4.26	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	509/1526	4.92	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1046/1490	3.91	4.01	4.11	4.19	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1065/1428	4.27	4.62	4.49	4.54	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	806/1436	4.82	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1160/1427	3.91	4.38	4.32	4.37	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	981/1425	4.18	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	4.14	4.16	4.33	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1102/1276	3.67	4.32	4.33	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	1226/1273	3.17	4.43	4.38	4.55	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	893/922	2.67	3.77	4.02	4.23	2.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 100
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	58/198	4.50	4.52	4.16	4.37	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	189/208	3.67	4.44	4.27	4.21	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	192/194	3.20	4.43	4.56	4.52	3.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	156/194	4.00	4.50	4.37	4.45	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	142/176	3.83	4.47	4.23	3.87	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400H 100
Title:	Honors Selected Topics I
Instructor:	Rivera,Megan W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	8	4.80	238/1528	4.80	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	704/1333	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.37	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	277/1495	4.70	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	657/1439	4.25	4.09	4.11	4.20	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	613/1425	4.30	4.10	4.12	4.26	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	722/1508	4.30	4.27	4.18	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.01	4.11	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	221/1428	4.90	4.62	4.49	4.54	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	506/1427	4.60	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	277/1425	4.80	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	290/1291	4.56	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	246/1271	4.75	4.14	4.16	4.33	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.43	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	218/922	4.50	3.77	4.02	4.23	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400H 100
Title:	Honors Selected Topics I
Instructor:	Rivera,Megan W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 404 100
Title:	Forest Ecology
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	13	4.93	128/1528	4.93	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	161/1527	4.86	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	192/1333	4.86	4.30	4.34	4.37	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	267/1495	4.71	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	626/1439	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.20	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1425	4.80	4.10	4.12	4.26	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	987/1508	4.08	4.27	4.18	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1490	4.92	4.01	4.11	4.19	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.62	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	231/1425	4.85	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	297/1291	4.55	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.43	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 404 100
Title:	Forest Ecology
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/42	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.73	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	7/41	4.92	4.31	4.06	4.33	4.92
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.97	4.74	4.57	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	11/32	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.24	4.60
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 416 100
Title:	Hydrology
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	4	6	4.36	805/1528	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	656/1527	4.45	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	425/1333	4.64	4.30	4.34	4.37	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	433/1439	4.45	4.09	4.11	4.20	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	726/1425	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.26	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	758/1508	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.24	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	948/1526	4.64	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	312/1490	4.55	4.01	4.11	4.19	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	806/1428	4.55	4.62	4.49	4.54	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1041/1427	4.10	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	622/1425	4.55	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	456/1291	4.36	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	961/1271	3.75	4.14	4.16	4.33	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	926/1276	4.00	4.32	4.33	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.55	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	4.73	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 416 100
Title:	Hydrology
Instructor:	Miller, Andrew J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 435 100
Title:	Glob Patterns Prod/Trade
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	4	9	4.57	555/1528	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	750/1333	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.37	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	962/1495	4.14	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	197/1439	4.71	4.09	4.11	4.20	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	466/1425	4.44	4.10	4.12	4.26	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	558/1508	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	191/1490	4.70	4.01	4.11	4.19	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	177/1428	4.93	4.62	4.49	4.54	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1427	4.93	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	220/1425	4.86	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	304/1291	4.54	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	197/1271	4.82	4.14	4.16	4.33	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	290/1276	4.82	4.32	4.33	4.49	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	235/1273	4.91	4.43	4.38	4.55	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	158/922	4.67	3.77	4.02	4.23	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 435 100
Title:	Glob Patterns Prod/Trade
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.34	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 451 100
Title:	Urban Sustainability
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	8	7	4.22	951/1528	4.22	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	1	9	1	3.24	1456/1527	3.24	4.28	4.28	4.30	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1333	****	4.30	4.34	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1392/1495	3.41	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	406/1439	4.47	4.09	4.11	4.20	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	4	3	3.33	1285/1425	3.33	4.10	4.12	4.26	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	5	5	2	2.94	1437/1508	2.94	4.27	4.18	4.24	2.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	2	9	4	0	3.00	1406/1490	3.00	4.01	4.11	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	7	6	3	3.65	1338/1428	3.65	4.62	4.49	4.54	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	996/1436	4.71	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1128/1427	3.94	4.38	4.32	4.37	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	4	6	3.53	1298/1425	3.53	4.38	4.34	4.37	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1276/1291	2.00	4.21	4.05	4.10	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	570/1271	4.38	4.14	4.16	4.33	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	719/1276	4.38	4.32	4.33	4.49	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	1	13	4.56	592/1273	4.56	4.43	4.38	4.55	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	316/922	4.33	3.77	4.02	4.23	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 451 100
Title:	Urban Sustainability
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	56/76	4.27	4.34	4.51	4.83	4.27
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	69/74	3.42	4.20	4.31	4.42	3.42
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	57/66	3.75	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	64/76	3.83	4.30	4.27	4.42	3.83
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	60/73	3.08	4.17	3.94	4.23	3.08
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	41/43	3.33	4.28	4.43	4.63	3.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	30/36	3.71	4.17	4.43	4.38	3.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 483 100
Title:	Gis Internship
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	1
Questionnaires:	1

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.26	4.25	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.09	4.11	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.27	4.18	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.01	4.11	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 497 800
Title:	Research Internship
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	2	4.67	434/1528	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.30	4.34	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.26	4.25	4.33	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.10	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.27	4.18	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	579/1490	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.19	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.43	4.38	4.55	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/42	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.73	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/41	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.33	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.97	4.74	4.57	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/32	5.00	4.60	4.20	4.24	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/29	5.00	4.43	4.34	4.11	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/43	5.00	4.28	4.43	4.63	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.60	4.53	4.17	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 497 800
Title:	Research Internship
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/36	4.67	4.17	4.43	4.38	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/21	5.00	4.44	4.54	4.33	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/20	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	3	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 601 1
Title:	Intro To Ges
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	0	7	4.56	578/1528	4.56	4.34	4.31	4.45	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1235/1527	3.89	4.28	4.28	4.36	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	****	4.30	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	992/1495	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	689/1439	4.22	4.09	4.11	4.24	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	992/1425	3.89	4.10	4.12	4.28	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	2	3	0	1	2.71	1471/1508	2.71	4.27	4.18	4.25	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	783/1526	4.78	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	675/1490	4.25	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	794/1428	4.56	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1043/1436	4.67	4.85	4.74	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1169/1427	3.89	4.38	4.32	4.36	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	951/1425	4.22	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1291	****	4.21	4.05	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	408/1273	4.75	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.77	4.02	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 601 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 9
Title: Intro To Ges		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Miller,Andrew J		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 616 100
Title:	Physical Hydrology
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	3	4.75	307/1528	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	259/1527	4.75	4.28	4.28	4.36	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.30	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	227/1495	4.75	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	168/1439	4.75	4.09	4.11	4.24	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	811/1526	4.75	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	579/1490	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	478/1428	4.75	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	667/1425	4.50	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1291	4.75	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.43	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.77	4.02	4.00	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 616 100
Title:	Physical Hydrology
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	138/198	4.00	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/208	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.40	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/194	5.00	4.43	4.56	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/194	5.00	4.50	4.37	4.64	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/176	5.00	4.47	4.23	4.66	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.34	4.51	4.51	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/74	5.00	4.20	4.31	4.32	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	42/73	4.00	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/42	5.00	3.76	4.00	3.86	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/41	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.01	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.97	4.74	4.95	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/32	5.00	4.60	4.20	4.42	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/29	4.00	4.43	4.34	4.36	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/43	5.00	4.28	4.43	4.43	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.60	4.53	4.67	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/36	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.54	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 616 100
Title:	Physical Hydrology
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/21	5.00	4.44	4.54	4.68	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/20	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.64	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 671 100
Title:	Spatial Database I
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	4	13	4.67	434/1528	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1527	4.83	4.28	4.28	4.36	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	219/1333	4.82	4.30	4.34	4.39	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	154/1495	4.83	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	283/1439	4.61	4.09	4.11	4.24	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	283/1425	4.63	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	129/1508	4.83	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	853/1526	4.72	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	236/1490	4.65	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	133/1428	4.94	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	270/1427	4.78	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	185/1425	4.89	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	130/1291	4.78	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	405/1271	4.56	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	329/1276	4.78	4.32	4.33	4.43	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	323/1273	4.82	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 671 100
Title:	Spatial Database I
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	33/198	4.67	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	51/208	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	58/194	4.80	4.43	4.56	4.58	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	45/194	4.70	4.50	4.37	4.64	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	34/176	4.67	4.47	4.23	4.66	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/76	4.80	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/76	****	4.30	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.17	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/42	****	3.76	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	4.31	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/43	****	4.28	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	4.60	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	4.17	4.43	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 671 100
Title:	Spatial Database I
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 678 100
Title:	GIS Project Management
Instructor:	Schlee,John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1408/1528	3.50	4.34	4.31	4.45	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	818/1527	4.33	4.28	4.28	4.36	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	830/1333	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	499/1439	4.40	4.09	4.11	4.24	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1167/1425	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.28	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1508	4.75	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1361/1490	3.25	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	478/1428	4.75	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1193/1425	3.83	4.38	4.34	4.34	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1024/1291	3.60	4.21	4.05	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	913/1271	3.83	4.14	4.16	4.27	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	926/1276	4.00	4.32	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	799/922	3.33	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 678 100
Title:	GIS Project Management
Instructor:	Schlee,John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.52	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/208	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.43	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	66/76	4.00	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	4.20	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	73/76	2.33	4.30	4.27	4.33	2.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	29/73	4.33	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	38/42	2.50	3.76	4.00	3.86	2.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/41	4.50	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.43	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	37/43	3.50	4.28	4.43	4.43	3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	29/31	3.50	4.60	4.53	4.67	3.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	36/36	2.50	4.17	4.43	4.54	2.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 678 100
Title:	GIS Project Management
Instructor:	Schlee,John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	4.44	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	4.32	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Lieberman,Joshu

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	1	2	2	3.57	1386/1528	3.57	4.34	4.31	4.45	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1383/1527	3.57	4.28	4.28	4.36	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1243/1333	3.50	4.30	4.34	4.39	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1341/1495	3.57	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1020/1439	3.80	4.09	4.11	4.24	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	786/1425	4.14	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1171/1508	3.86	4.27	4.18	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1239/1490	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1151/1428	4.19	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.83	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1080/1427	4.29	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1282/1425	4.10	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	913/1271	3.83	4.14	4.16	4.27	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Lieberman,Joshu

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	44/198	4.60	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	131/208	4.20	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	144/194	4.40	4.43	4.56	4.58	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	116/194	4.40	4.50	4.37	4.64	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	71/176	4.40	4.47	4.23	4.66	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	66/76	4.00	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	56/74	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.32	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	39/66	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	43/76	4.40	4.30	4.27	4.33	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	36/73	4.20	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	30/42	3.00	3.76	4.00	3.86	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	28/41	3.50	4.31	4.06	4.01	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.97	4.74	4.95	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/32	4.33	4.60	4.20	4.42	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/29	4.33	4.43	4.34	4.36	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	28/43	4.25	4.28	4.43	4.43	4.25
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/31	4.50	4.60	4.53	4.67	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	24/36	4.25	4.17	4.43	4.54	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Lieberman,Joshu

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	16/21	4.00	4.44	4.54	4.68	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	14/20	4.00	4.32	4.45	4.64	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Wilson,Ronald E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	1	2	2	3.57	1386/1528	3.57	4.34	4.31	4.45	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1383/1527	3.57	4.28	4.28	4.36	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1243/1333	3.50	4.30	4.34	4.39	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1341/1495	3.57	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1020/1439	3.80	4.09	4.11	4.24	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	786/1425	4.14	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1171/1508	3.86	4.27	4.18	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	911/1490	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1151/1428	4.19	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.83	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	891/1427	4.29	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	908/1425	4.10	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	913/1271	3.83	4.14	4.16	4.27	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Wilson,Ronald E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	44/198	4.60	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	131/208	4.20	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	144/194	4.40	4.43	4.56	4.58	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	116/194	4.40	4.50	4.37	4.64	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	71/176	4.40	4.47	4.23	4.66	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	66/76	4.00	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	56/74	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.32	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	39/66	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	43/76	4.40	4.30	4.27	4.33	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	36/73	4.20	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	30/42	3.00	3.76	4.00	3.86	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	28/41	3.50	4.31	4.06	4.01	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.97	4.74	4.95	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/32	4.33	4.60	4.20	4.42	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/29	4.33	4.43	4.34	4.36	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	28/43	4.25	4.28	4.43	4.43	4.25
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/31	4.50	4.60	4.53	4.67	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	24/36	4.25	4.17	4.43	4.54	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 773 100	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 8
Title: GIS Modeling Techniques		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Wilson,Ronald E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	16/21	4.00	4.44	4.54	4.68	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	14/20	4.00	4.32	4.45	4.64	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Paladino,Louis

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	1	2	2	3.57	1386/1528	3.57	4.34	4.31	4.45	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1383/1527	3.57	4.28	4.28	4.36	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1243/1333	3.50	4.30	4.34	4.39	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1341/1495	3.57	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1020/1439	3.80	4.09	4.11	4.24	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	786/1425	4.14	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1171/1508	3.86	4.27	4.18	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	344/1490	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1058/1428	4.19	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.83	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1427	4.29	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	785/1425	4.10	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	913/1271	3.83	4.14	4.16	4.27	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Paladino,Louis

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	44/198	4.60	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	131/208	4.20	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	144/194	4.40	4.43	4.56	4.58	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	116/194	4.40	4.50	4.37	4.64	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	71/176	4.40	4.47	4.23	4.66	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	66/76	4.00	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	56/74	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.32	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	39/66	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	43/76	4.40	4.30	4.27	4.33	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	36/73	4.20	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	30/42	3.00	3.76	4.00	3.86	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	28/41	3.50	4.31	4.06	4.01	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.97	4.74	4.95	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/32	4.33	4.60	4.20	4.42	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/29	4.33	4.43	4.34	4.36	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	28/43	4.25	4.28	4.43	4.43	4.25
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/31	4.50	4.60	4.53	4.67	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	24/36	4.25	4.17	4.43	4.54	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 773 100
Title:	GIS Modeling Techniques
Instructor:	Paladino,Louis

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	16/21	4.00	4.44	4.54	4.68	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	14/20	4.00	4.32	4.45	4.64	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 100
Title:	GIS Data Sources
Instructor:	May,Nora C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	6	4.75	307/1528	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	143/1527	4.88	4.28	4.28	4.36	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	436/1333	4.63	4.30	4.34	4.39	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	313/1495	4.67	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	657/1439	4.25	4.09	4.11	4.24	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	329/1425	4.57	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	618/1526	4.88	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	911/1490	4.14	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	478/1428	4.80	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	297/1427	4.80	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	529/1425	4.60	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	654/1291	4.06	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	780/1271	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	4.32	4.33	4.43	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	947/1273	4.00	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	719/922	3.50	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 100
Title:	GIS Data Sources
Instructor:	May,Nora C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	58/198	4.50	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/208	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	167/194	4.00	4.43	4.56	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	128/194	4.33	4.50	4.37	4.64	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	40/76	4.50	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	35/74	4.50	4.20	4.31	4.32	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/73	4.67	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	28/42	3.33	3.76	4.00	3.86	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	22/41	4.33	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/29	4.50	4.43	4.34	4.36	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/43	4.67	4.28	4.43	4.43	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.60	4.53	4.67	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/36	4.67	4.17	4.43	4.54	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 100
Title:	GIS Data Sources
Instructor:	May,Nora C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/21	5.00	4.44	4.54	4.68	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/20	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.64	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 100
Title:	GIS Data Sources
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	6	4.75	307/1528	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	143/1527	4.88	4.28	4.28	4.36	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	436/1333	4.63	4.30	4.34	4.39	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	313/1495	4.67	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	657/1439	4.25	4.09	4.11	4.24	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	329/1425	4.57	4.10	4.12	4.28	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	618/1526	4.88	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	639/1490	4.14	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	303/1428	4.80	4.62	4.49	4.56	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1427	4.80	4.38	4.32	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	589/1425	4.60	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	728/1291	4.06	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	780/1271	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	4.32	4.33	4.43	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	947/1273	4.00	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	719/922	3.50	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 100
Title:	GIS Data Sources
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	58/198	4.50	4.52	4.16	4.54	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/208	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.40	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	167/194	4.00	4.43	4.56	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	128/194	4.33	4.50	4.37	4.64	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.47	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	40/76	4.50	4.34	4.51	4.51	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	35/74	4.50	4.20	4.31	4.32	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.27	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/73	4.67	4.17	3.94	3.81	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	28/42	3.33	3.76	4.00	3.86	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	22/41	4.33	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.97	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.60	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/29	4.50	4.43	4.34	4.36	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/43	4.67	4.28	4.43	4.43	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.60	4.53	4.67	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/36	4.67	4.17	4.43	4.54	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 100
Title:	GIS Data Sources
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/21	5.00	4.44	4.54	4.68	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/20	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.64	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 898 301
Title:	Pre Candidacy Doc Resh
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	1
Questionnaires:	1

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.26	4.25	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.09	4.11	4.24	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.10	4.12	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1490/1490	1.00	4.01	4.11	4.16	1.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
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.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						