

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 185 |
| Questionnaires: | 109 |

| 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 | 23 | 27 | 53 | 4.16 | 1016/1520 | 3.93 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 4.16 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 24 | 37 | 40 | 3.99 | 1096/1520 | 3.87 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 3.99 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 32 | 50 | 4.08 | 934/1291 | 3.85 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.08 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 26 | 40 | 26 | 3.67 | 1254/1483 | 3.65 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 3.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 21 | 30 | 35 | 3.72 | 1058/1417 | 3.52 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 3.72 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 35 | 27 | 24 | 3.41 | 1241/1405 | 3.53 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | 3.41 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 28 | 59 | 4.26 | 748/1504 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.26 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 106 | 4.95 | 296/1519 | 4.86 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.95 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 60 | 21 | 4.04 | 863/1495 | 3.69 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.04 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 76 | 4.65 | 648/1459 | 4.41 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 92 | 4.84 | 727/1460 | 4.78 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.84 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 30 | 61 | 4.43 | 736/1455 | 4.23 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.43 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 26 | 71 | 4.56 | 620/1456 | 4.27 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 26 | 59 | 4.29 | 508/1316 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.29 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 19 | 10 | 31 | 3.74 | 946/1243 | 3.58 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 3.74 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 36 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 3.15 | 1192/1241 | 3.57 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.15 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 35 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 14 | 16 | 27 | 3.57 | 1124/1236 | 4.04 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 3.57 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: GES 102 100 | Term - Fall 2011 | Enrollment: 185 |
| Title: Human Geography | | Questionnaires: 109 |
| 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 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 35 | 51 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3.13 | ****/889 | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|-----|-----------|-----|
| 00-27 | 31 | 0.00-0.99 | 5 | A | 33 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 15 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 49 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 12 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 23 | General | 80 | Under-grad | 109 | Non-major | 109 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 12 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 20 | F | 0 | Electives | 10 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102 200 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Jeffrey,Scott |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 199 |
| Questionnaires: | 125 |

| 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 | 6 | 13 | 27 | 45 | 32 | 3.68 | 1334/1520 | 3.93 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 3.68 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 32 | 39 | 26 | 3.46 | 1388/1520 | 3.87 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 3.46 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 28 | 30 | 29 | 3.30 | 1240/1291 | 3.85 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 3.30 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 79 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 3.36 | 1382/1483 | 3.65 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 3.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 6 | 9 | 22 | 13 | 27 | 22 | 26 | 3.15 | 1316/1417 | 3.52 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 3.15 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 8 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 3.68 | ****/1405 | 3.53 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 7 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 20 | 64 | 4.09 | 924/1504 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.09 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 106 | 4.89 | 632/1519 | 4.86 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 29 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 34 | 30 | 14 | 3.32 | 1353/1495 | 3.69 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 3.32 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 9 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 22 | 46 | 36 | 3.87 | 1296/1459 | 4.41 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 3.87 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 87 | 4.68 | 1024/1460 | 4.78 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.68 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 9 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 44 | 36 | 3.78 | 1228/1455 | 4.23 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 3.78 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 18 | 29 | 48 | 3.81 | 1217/1456 | 4.27 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 3.81 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 10 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 21 | 26 | 42 | 3.71 | 966/1316 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 3.71 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 65 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 17 | 20 | 12 | 3.43 | 1082/1243 | 3.58 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 3.43 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 64 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 26 | 3.89 | 998/1241 | 3.57 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 64 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 32 | 4.10 | 920/1236 | 4.04 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.10 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 64 | 51 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | ****/889 | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102 200 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Jeffrey,Scott |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 199 |
| Questionnaires: | 125 |

| 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 | 117 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 118 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2.86 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 118 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 120 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 119 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 4.26 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 120 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 121 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 121 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 120 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 120 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 3.90 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 120 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.80 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 120 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 120 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 120 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 119 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 119 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.22 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 119 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.99 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102 200 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Jeffrey, Scott |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 199 |
| Questionnaires: | 125 |

| 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 | 119 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 119 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|----------------|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 3 | A 7 | Required for Majors 12 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 12 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 56 | | Major 0 |
| 56-83 | 13 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 31 | General 68 | Under-grad 125 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 9 | D 1 | | Non-major 125 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 9 | F 0 | Electives 12 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 3 | |
| | | | ? 29 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102 300 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Biehler,Dawn |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 185 |
| Questionnaires: | 102 |

| 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 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 38 | 34 | 3.95 | 1168/1520 | 3.93 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 3.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 24 | 51 | 4.15 | 989/1520 | 3.87 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.15 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 19 | 25 | 51 | 4.17 | 880/1291 | 3.85 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 20 | 38 | 31 | 3.92 | 1112/1483 | 3.65 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 3.92 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 3.68 | 1090/1417 | 3.52 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 3.68 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 27 | 31 | 28 | 3.65 | 1122/1405 | 3.53 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | 3.65 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 25 | 56 | 4.26 | 748/1504 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.26 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 77 | 4.74 | 864/1519 | 4.86 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.74 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 15 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 47 | 9 | 3.71 | 1166/1495 | 3.69 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 3.71 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 76 | 4.71 | 534/1459 | 4.41 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 83 | 4.81 | 806/1460 | 4.78 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 24 | 62 | 4.48 | 674/1455 | 4.23 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 21 | 64 | 4.44 | 756/1456 | 4.27 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 54 | 4.27 | 528/1316 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.27 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 55 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 16 | 3.55 | 1040/1243 | 3.58 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 3.55 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 56 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 17 | 3.67 | 1086/1241 | 3.57 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 29 | 4.46 | 687/1236 | 4.04 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.46 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 56 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 12 | 3.55 | 694/889 | 3.55 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | 3.55 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102 300 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Biehler,Dawn |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 185 |
| Questionnaires: | 102 |

| 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 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 99 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 4.26 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 3.90 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 100 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.22 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.99 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102 300 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Biehler,Dawn |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 185 |
| Questionnaires: | 102 |

| 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 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|----------------|
| 00-27 | 15 | 0.00-0.99 4 | A 35 | Required for Majors 10 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 41 | | |
| 56-83 | 9 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 11 | General 62 | Under-grad 102 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 10 | D 1 | | Non-major 102 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 13 | F 0 | Electives 11 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 14 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102Y 202 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Biehler,Dawn |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.80 | 1277/1520 | 3.80 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 940/1520 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1291 | **** | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.89 | 1135/1483 | 3.89 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 3.89 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | 1253/1417 | 3.33 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 3.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3.10 | 1322/1405 | 3.10 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | 3.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.10 | 916/1504 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.10 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | 891/1495 | 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1230/1459 | 4.00 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 1048/1460 | 4.67 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 450/1455 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 866/1456 | 4.33 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1316 | **** | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3.78 | 921/1243 | 3.78 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 3.78 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 188/1241 | 4.89 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1236 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 186/889 | 4.50 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 102Y 202 |
| Title: | Human Geography |
| Instructor: | Biehler,Dawn |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| 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 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.51 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 110 1 |
| Title: | Physical Geography |
| Instructor: | Miller,Andrew J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 151 |
| Questionnaires: | 76 |

| 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 | 2 | 13 | 25 | 34 | 4.23 | 954/1520 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 20 | 37 | 4.26 | 884/1520 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.26 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 23 | 42 | 4.42 | 681/1291 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.42 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 24 | 4.22 | 831/1483 | 4.01 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 28 | 3.95 | 867/1417 | 3.72 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 3.95 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 55 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 3.47 | ****/1405 | 3.37 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 15 | 43 | 4.33 | 669/1504 | 4.28 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 66 | 4.85 | 713/1519 | 4.84 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.85 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 18 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 43 | 5 | 3.91 | 1008/1495 | 3.99 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 3.91 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 60 | 4.81 | 374/1459 | 4.73 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 66 | 4.89 | 596/1460 | 4.86 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 45 | 4.50 | 637/1455 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 41 | 4.43 | 767/1456 | 4.42 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 44 | 4.44 | 365/1316 | 4.40 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.44 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 16 | 3.54 | 1048/1243 | 3.33 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 3.54 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 38 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 19 | 4.00 | 922/1241 | 3.48 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 38 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 19 | 3.89 | 1020/1236 | 3.67 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 3.89 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 39 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.38 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 110 1 |
| Title: | Physical Geography |
| Instructor: | Miller,Andrew J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 151 |
| Questionnaires: | 76 |

| 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 | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 74 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 74 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 4.26 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 74 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.43 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 74 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 74 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.22 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 73 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.99 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 73 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.14 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 110 1 |
| Title: | Physical Geography |
| Instructor: | Miller,Andrew J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 151 |
| Questionnaires: | 76 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 73 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 17 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 12 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 34 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 11 | General | 39 | Under-grad | 76 | Non-major | 75 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 11 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 110 2 |
| Title: | Physical Geography |
| Instructor: | Halverson, Jeffr |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 160 |
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 21 | 40 | 4.16 | 1008/1520 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 4.16 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 20 | 42 | 4.21 | 940/1520 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 17 | 43 | 4.18 | 872/1291 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.18 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 19 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 16 | 23 | 3.80 | 1183/1483 | 4.01 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 24 | 21 | 3.49 | 1194/1417 | 3.72 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 3.49 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 41 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 3.37 | 1255/1405 | 3.37 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | 3.37 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 23 | 42 | 4.24 | 759/1504 | 4.28 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.24 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 67 | 4.84 | 733/1519 | 4.84 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 18 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 29 | 19 | 4.07 | 849/1495 | 3.99 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.07 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 64 | 4.66 | 632/1459 | 4.73 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.66 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 72 | 4.84 | 727/1460 | 4.86 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.84 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 53 | 4.44 | 711/1455 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 53 | 4.40 | 788/1456 | 4.42 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 49 | 4.37 | 436/1316 | 4.40 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.37 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 14 | 3.13 | 1172/1243 | 3.33 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 3.13 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 37 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 2.96 | 1210/1241 | 3.48 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 2.96 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 37 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 17 | 3.44 | 1153/1236 | 3.67 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 3.44 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 37 | 31 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 110 2 |
| Title: | Physical Geography |
| Instructor: | Halverson, Jeffr |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 160 |
| 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 | 63 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 3.62 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 68 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3.86 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 68 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 68 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.40 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 68 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.56 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 4.26 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 67 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.22 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 71 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.86 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 71 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.01 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 72 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.29 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 71 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.43 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 3.90 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 68 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2.43 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 70 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.08 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 72 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3.75 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 72 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.25 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 72 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.20 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 70 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 3.33 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 70 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3.33 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.22 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 71 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.99 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 110 2 |
| Title: | Physical Geography |
| Instructor: | Halverson, Jeffr |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 160 |
| 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 | 71 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 72 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.13 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 24 | Required for Majors 16 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 29 | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 11 | General 39 | Under-grad 82 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 9 | D 1 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives 8 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 17 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 162 |
| Questionnaires: | 66 |

| 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 | 7 | 15 | 41 | 4.42 | 725/1520 | 4.42 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 43 | 4.52 | 569/1520 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 48 | 4.55 | 504/1291 | 4.55 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 38 | 4.47 | 535/1483 | 4.47 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 42 | 4.39 | 482/1417 | 4.39 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 4.39 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 24 | 4.06 | 813/1405 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.96 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 45 | 4.57 | 373/1504 | 4.57 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 61 | 4.94 | 414/1519 | 4.94 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 26 | 4.35 | 556/1495 | 4.35 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.35 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 61 | 4.91 | 199/1459 | 4.91 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 64 | 4.97 | 218/1460 | 4.97 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 52 | 4.71 | 387/1455 | 4.71 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 48 | 4.62 | 553/1456 | 4.62 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.62 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 51 | 4.68 | 187/1316 | 4.68 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.68 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 21 | 4.16 | 700/1243 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 4.16 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 28 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 27 | 4.50 | 564/1241 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 32 | 4.76 | 391/1236 | 4.76 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.76 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 29 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 4.21 | 360/889 | 4.21 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.89 | 4.21 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 162 |
| Questionnaires: | 66 |

| 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 | 62 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 63 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 64 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 63 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 63 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 3.90 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 64 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 64 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 65 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 5.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 63 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 63 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.22 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.99 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 63 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.14 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 162 |
| Questionnaires: | 66 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 63 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 13 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 17 | Required for Majors | 17 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 23 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 8 | General | 27 | Under-grad | 66 | Non-major | 66 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 14 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 4.67 | 399/1520 | 4.67 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.71 | 306/1520 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 4.82 | 222/1291 | 4.82 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.44 | 4.82 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 4.61 | 399/1483 | 4.61 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.28 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 4.05 | 779/1417 | 4.05 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.05 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.48 | 421/1405 | 4.48 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.48 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 4.48 | 476/1504 | 4.48 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.48 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 4.96 | 296/1519 | 4.96 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 4.47 | 390/1495 | 4.47 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.47 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 4.70 | 568/1459 | 4.70 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 4.91 | 489/1460 | 4.91 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.80 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.70 | 413/1455 | 4.70 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 4.83 | 292/1456 | 4.83 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 4.39 | 409/1316 | 4.39 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.18 | 4.39 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 624/1243 | 4.25 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 455/1241 | 4.63 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 749/1236 | 4.38 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.45 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 150/889 | 4.63 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 4.63 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 24 |

| 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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | 18/164 | 4.82 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.57 | 4.82 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00 | 1/165 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 13/160 | 4.94 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.74 | 4.94 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | 35/158 | 4.82 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.63 | 4.82 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 23/150 | 4.65 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 4.59 | 4.65 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 23 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| 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 | 1 | 7 | 27 | 4.50 | 607/1520 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 23 | 4.47 | 625/1520 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 26 | 4.49 | 576/1291 | 4.49 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.44 | 4.49 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 25 | 4.61 | 386/1483 | 4.61 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.28 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 3.65 | 1104/1417 | 3.65 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.65 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 4.42 | 493/1405 | 4.42 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.42 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 24 | 4.49 | 463/1504 | 4.49 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.49 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 4.86 | 672/1519 | 4.86 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.86 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 22 | 4.63 | 247/1495 | 4.63 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.63 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 4.91 | 179/1459 | 4.91 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 5.00 | 1/1460 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.80 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 26 | 4.69 | 425/1455 | 4.69 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 25 | 4.63 | 553/1456 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 22 | 4.53 | 296/1316 | 4.53 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 4.35 | 559/1243 | 4.35 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.35 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 4.30 | 734/1241 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.30 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 4.43 | 702/1236 | 4.43 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.45 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.78 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.99 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| 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 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 22 | 4.50 | 44/164 | 4.50 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.57 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 23 | 4.59 | 42/165 | 4.59 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.40 | 4.59 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 4.90 | 22/160 | 4.90 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.74 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.63 | 63/158 | 4.63 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.63 | 4.63 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 4.37 | 56/150 | 4.37 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 4.59 | 4.37 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.34 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 29 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 29 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 29 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.34 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 4.55 | 17/32 | 4.55 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.37 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 16 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.36 | 17/31 | 4.36 | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.11 | 4.36 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 4.65 | 11/23 | 4.65 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.65 | 4.65 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.67 | 8/27 | 4.67 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.67 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 17 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.53 | 8/20 | 4.53 | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.53 | 4.53 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.60 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.87 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 4.93 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| 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 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.85 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3.71 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.86 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 6 | Required for Majors 18 | Graduate 0 Major 7 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 19 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 3 | C 8 | General 7 | Under-grad 38 Non-major 31 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 6 | D 1 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 302 1 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Holland,Margare |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| 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 | 10 | 19 | 4.60 | 479/1520 | 4.43 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 14 | 4.33 | 809/1520 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 18 | 4.53 | 514/1291 | 4.39 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 18 | 4.57 | 436/1483 | 4.35 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 17 | 4.37 | 511/1417 | 3.78 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.37 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 4.62 | 267/1405 | 4.29 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.62 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 4.03 | 974/1504 | 4.21 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.03 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 4.90 | 592/1519 | 4.56 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 4.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 4.00 | 891/1495 | 3.98 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 4.62 | 680/1459 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 435/1460 | 4.96 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 13 | 4.32 | 853/1455 | 4.20 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 4.54 | 651/1456 | 4.46 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.54 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 4.46 | 347/1316 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.46 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.43 | 493/1243 | 4.33 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.43 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.64 | 435/1241 | 4.65 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 366/1236 | 4.67 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.79 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 302 1 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Holland,Margare |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 309/889 | 4.15 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.31 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 15 | Required for Majors | 24 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 3 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 28 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 302 3 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Baker,Matthew E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 4.25 | 924/1520 | 4.43 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 4.13 | 1005/1520 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 4.25 | 816/1291 | 4.39 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 4.13 | 938/1483 | 4.35 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3.20 | 1304/1417 | 3.78 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 3.96 | 902/1405 | 4.29 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.96 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 4.39 | 581/1504 | 4.21 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.39 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 4.23 | 1335/1519 | 4.56 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 4.23 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 3.95 | 956/1495 | 3.98 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.95 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 4.52 | 808/1459 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5.00 | 1/1460 | 4.96 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 4.09 | 1037/1455 | 4.20 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 4.39 | 799/1456 | 4.46 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 4.23 | 567/1316 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.23 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | 645/1243 | 4.33 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.22 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 415/1241 | 4.65 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 606/1236 | 4.67 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.56 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 302 3 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Baker,Matthew E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4.00 | 456/889 | 4.15 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 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 | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 C 8 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 F 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 308 1 |
| Title: | Ecology |
| Instructor: | Swan,Christophe |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 69 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| 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 | 8 | 14 | 18 | 4.20 | 983/1520 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 16 | 4.20 | 948/1520 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 4.37 | 730/1291 | 4.37 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.37 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 3.64 | 1263/1483 | 3.64 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 3.64 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 3.84 | 978/1417 | 3.84 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.84 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 24 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3.65 | 1127/1405 | 3.65 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.65 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 15 | 3.95 | 1050/1504 | 3.95 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 3.95 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 4.93 | 473/1519 | 4.93 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 15 | 6 | 3.66 | 1210/1495 | 3.66 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.66 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 31 | 4.68 | 584/1459 | 4.68 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.68 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 20 | 4.27 | 1334/1460 | 4.27 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.27 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 14 | 4.00 | 1075/1455 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 19 | 4.15 | 1027/1456 | 4.15 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.15 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 3.83 | 877/1316 | 3.83 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 3.83 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2.67 | 1220/1243 | 2.67 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 2.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 29 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3.75 | 1056/1241 | 3.75 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3.58 | 1119/1236 | 3.58 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.58 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.12 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 308 1 |
| Title: | Ecology |
| Instructor: | Swan,Christophe |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 69 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| 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 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.47 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.98 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.75 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 3.94 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.82 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 3.90 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.60 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 32 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 21 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 41 | Non-major | 37 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 311 1 |
| Title: | Weather And Climate |
| Instructor: | Tokay,Ali |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| 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 | 14 | 16 | 4.48 | 636/1520 | 4.48 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 4.19 | 948/1520 | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.19 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 4.00 | 974/1291 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 4.19 | 863/1483 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.19 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.24 | 1292/1417 | 3.24 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.24 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4.00 | 843/1405 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 20 | 4.48 | 463/1504 | 4.48 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.48 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 4.84 | 733/1519 | 4.84 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 6 | 4.04 | 863/1495 | 4.04 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.04 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 18 | 4.50 | 833/1459 | 4.50 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 4.90 | 544/1460 | 4.90 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 12 | 4.23 | 937/1455 | 4.23 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.23 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 4.47 | 725/1456 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 3.96 | 769/1316 | 3.96 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 3.96 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | 865/1243 | 3.88 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3.63 | 1103/1241 | 3.63 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.63 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.75 | 1064/1236 | 3.75 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 311 1 |
| Title: | Weather And Climate |
| Instructor: | Tokay,Ali |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 24 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 6 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 31 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 10 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 328 1 |
| Title: | Environmental Policy |
| Instructor: | Lansing,David |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 43 |
| 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 | 1 | 14 | 17 | 4.50 | 607/1520 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 4.06 | 1047/1520 | 4.06 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.06 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 13 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 3.84 | 1060/1291 | 3.84 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 3.84 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 9 | 4.03 | 995/1483 | 4.03 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.03 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 25 | 4.75 | 156/1417 | 4.75 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 12 | 4.25 | 656/1405 | 4.25 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 3.94 | 1070/1504 | 3.94 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 3.94 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 9 | 4.31 | 605/1495 | 4.31 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 15 | 4.31 | 1046/1459 | 4.31 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.31 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 4.75 | 903/1460 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 13 | 4.25 | 920/1455 | 4.25 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 18 | 4.47 | 725/1456 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 4.17 | 619/1316 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4.33 | 567/1243 | 4.33 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 537/1241 | 4.53 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 564/1236 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 328 1 |
| Title: | Environmental Policy |
| Instructor: | Lansing,David |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 43 |
| Questionnaires: | 33 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4.40 | 255/889 | 4.40 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.40 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 22 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 19 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 8 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 30 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| 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 | 4 | 21 | 4.84 | 194/1520 | 4.84 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 4.92 | 92/1520 | 4.92 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.92 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 4.88 | 157/1291 | 4.88 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 21 | 4.72 | 253/1483 | 4.72 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.72 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 4.52 | 346/1417 | 4.52 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.52 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 4.68 | 219/1405 | 4.68 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.68 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 4.64 | 291/1504 | 4.64 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.64 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 4.35 | 544/1495 | 4.35 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.35 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 22 | 4.80 | 374/1459 | 4.80 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 4.88 | 622/1460 | 4.88 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 4.84 | 226/1455 | 4.84 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.84 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 4.92 | 160/1456 | 4.92 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 4.63 | 221/1316 | 4.63 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.63 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.81 | 192/1243 | 4.81 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.81 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 4.63 | 455/1241 | 4.63 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 4.88 | 252/1236 | 4.88 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.88 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.47 | 213/889 | 4.47 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.47 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| 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 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.12 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.47 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.98 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.75 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.14 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 3.94 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.82 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.77 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.50 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 3.90 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| 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 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.40 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.70 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 341 1 |
| Title: | Urban Geography |
| Instructor: | Neff,Robert |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 35 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| 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 | 5 | 19 | 4.59 | 491/1520 | 4.59 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 20 | 4.59 | 457/1520 | 4.59 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.59 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.65 | 395/1291 | 4.65 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 4.56 | 436/1483 | 4.56 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 14 | 4.29 | 578/1417 | 4.29 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 11 | 4.14 | 759/1405 | 4.14 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.14 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.48 | 463/1504 | 4.48 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.48 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 7 | 4.16 | 1371/1519 | 4.16 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 4.16 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4.11 | 822/1495 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.11 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 4.54 | 796/1459 | 4.54 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 4.81 | 806/1460 | 4.81 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 4.48 | 661/1455 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 4.64 | 528/1456 | 4.64 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 4.26 | 528/1316 | 4.26 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.26 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 4.50 | 405/1243 | 4.50 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 4.50 | 564/1241 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 4.68 | 486/1236 | 4.68 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.68 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.33 | 292/889 | 4.33 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 341 1 |
| Title: | Urban Geography |
| Instructor: | Neff,Robert |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 35 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| 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 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.12 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.47 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.98 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.75 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.14 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4.50 | 18/32 | 4.50 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 3.94 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.29 | 18/31 | 4.29 | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.82 | 4.29 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.57 | 13/23 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.77 | 4.57 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.50 | 11/27 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.29 | 11/20 | 4.29 | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.50 | 4.29 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 3.90 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 341 1 |
| Title: | Urban Geography |
| Instructor: | Neff,Robert |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 35 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| 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 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.40 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.70 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 4 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 7 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 381 1 |
| Title: | Remote Sensing |
| Instructor: | Rabenhorst,Thom |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| 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 | 4 | 7 | 4.38 | 778/1520 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3.69 | 1306/1520 | 3.69 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.69 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 974/1291 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3.85 | 1159/1483 | 3.85 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 3.85 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.63 | 1393/1417 | 2.63 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 2.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3.78 | 1059/1405 | 3.78 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.78 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.08 | 940/1504 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.08 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.30 | 1361/1495 | 3.30 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.30 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 463/1459 | 4.75 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 489/1460 | 4.92 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 989/1455 | 4.17 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3.92 | 1163/1456 | 3.92 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 3.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.00 | 729/1316 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 886/1243 | 3.83 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 713/1241 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 649/1236 | 4.50 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 381 1 |
| Title: | Remote Sensing |
| Instructor: | Rabenhorst,Thom |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| 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 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.12 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.47 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.98 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.75 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.14 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 3.94 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 3.82 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 3.90 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 381 1 |
| Title: | Remote Sensing |
| Instructor: | Rabenhorst,Thom |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.60 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|--------|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 386 1 |
| Title: | Intro Geog Info Systems |
| Instructor: | Tang,Junmei |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4.46 | 666/1520 | 4.46 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 639/1520 | 4.46 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.46 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 494/1291 | 4.56 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 564/1483 | 4.45 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.70 | 1070/1417 | 3.70 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.70 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.91 | 961/1405 | 3.91 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.91 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.62 | 321/1504 | 4.62 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.69 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3.83 | 1075/1495 | 3.83 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 3.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 953/1459 | 4.42 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 903/1460 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.25 | 920/1455 | 4.25 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.83 | 1203/1456 | 3.83 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 3.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 4.08 | 680/1316 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.08 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.29 | 1132/1243 | 3.29 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.29 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.83 | 1021/1241 | 3.83 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.83 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 709/1236 | 4.43 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 778/889 | 3.25 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 3.25 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 386 1 |
| Title: | Intro Geog Info Systems |
| Instructor: | Tang,Junmei |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| 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 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/164 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.12 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/165 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/160 | 5.00 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/158 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 14/150 | 4.78 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.98 | 4.78 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 4 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 10 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | 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 400 1 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Lansing,David |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| 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 | 7 | 12 | 4.63 | 439/1520 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 4.68 | 333/1520 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.68 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 4.83 | 204/1291 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.61 | 386/1483 | 4.58 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.61 | 273/1417 | 3.76 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.61 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4.28 | 635/1405 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.28 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 4.28 | 726/1504 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.28 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 4.88 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 4.53 | 324/1495 | 4.23 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.53 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 4.41 | 953/1459 | 4.71 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.41 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 326/1460 | 4.91 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 4.47 | 674/1455 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.47 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 4.82 | 292/1456 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.82 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.33 | 462/1316 | 4.47 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 221/1243 | 4.76 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.78 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1241 | 4.92 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 239/1236 | 4.80 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 4.89 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 292/889 | 4.33 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 400 1 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Lansing,David |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| 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 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/164 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.23 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/160 | 5.00 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/158 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.49 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/150 | 4.50 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.93 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.19 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.04 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.01 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 3.99 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 3.43 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 400 1 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Lansing,David |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| 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 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 2.94 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.28 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 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 400 2 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Tang,Junmei |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| 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 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 1041/1520 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4.13 | 1005/1520 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 974/1291 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 374/1483 | 4.58 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.43 | 1217/1417 | 3.76 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 843/1405 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 98/1504 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.88 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 1001/1519 | 4.88 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.63 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 891/1495 | 4.23 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 251/1459 | 4.71 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 622/1460 | 4.91 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4.00 | 1075/1455 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 945/1456 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 312/1316 | 4.47 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1243 | 4.76 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1241 | 4.92 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 649/1236 | 4.80 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 4.50 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/164 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 400 2 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Tang,Junmei |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/165 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/160 | 5.00 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/158 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 39/150 | 4.50 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.93 | 4.50 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 400 3 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Weissberger,Eri |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| 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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.43 | 725/1520 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 4.14 | 989/1520 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.14 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 4.36 | 739/1291 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.50 | 493/1483 | 4.58 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.23 | 1292/1417 | 3.76 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.23 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4.08 | 808/1405 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3.64 | 1272/1504 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.64 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 4.88 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 770/1495 | 4.23 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.15 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 286/1459 | 4.71 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 435/1460 | 4.91 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 413/1455 | 4.39 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.71 | 439/1456 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.57 | 256/1316 | 4.47 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.57 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 405/1243 | 4.76 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 324/1241 | 4.92 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1236 | 4.80 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/889 | 4.33 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 400 3 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Geog |
| Instructor: | Weissberger,Eri |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| 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 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 5 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | 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 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 404 1 |
| Title: | Forest Ecology |
| Instructor: | Baker,Matthew E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 153/1520 | 4.86 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 185/1291 | 4.86 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 171/1483 | 4.80 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 229/1417 | 4.67 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 385/1405 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 224/1504 | 4.71 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 351/1495 | 4.50 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 748/1459 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1460 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 558/1455 | 4.57 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1456 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 462/1316 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1243 | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 415/1241 | 4.67 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 505/1236 | 4.67 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 404 1 |
| Title: | Forest Ecology |
| Instructor: | Baker,Matthew E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/164 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 54/165 | 4.50 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.50 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 43/160 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/158 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 39/150 | 4.50 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.93 | 4.50 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.04 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.01 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 408 1 |
| Title: | Field Ecology |
| Instructor: | Swan,Christophe |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 26 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| 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 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 479/1520 | 4.60 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.45 | 653/1520 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.45 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 442/1291 | 4.60 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.55 | 446/1483 | 4.55 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3.26 | 1281/1417 | 3.26 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.26 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.20 | 708/1405 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.20 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 4.55 | 384/1504 | 4.55 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.55 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 4.70 | 911/1519 | 4.70 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.70 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.59 | 279/1495 | 4.59 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.59 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.75 | 463/1459 | 4.75 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 544/1460 | 4.90 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4.50 | 637/1455 | 4.50 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 4.35 | 844/1456 | 4.35 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.35 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 4.22 | 567/1316 | 4.22 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.22 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1243 | **** | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1241 | **** | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1236 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 408 1 |
| Title: | Field Ecology |
| Instructor: | Swan,Christophe |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 26 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| 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 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.23 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.49 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.93 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.60 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 23/32 | 4.20 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 14/31 | 4.50 | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 16/23 | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 15/27 | 4.33 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 408 1 |
| Title: | Field Ecology |
| Instructor: | Swan,Christophe |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 26 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 14/20 | 4.00 | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.01 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | 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 411 1 |
| Title: | Fluvial Morphology |
| Instructor: | Miller,Andrew J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| 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 | 8 | 4.54 | 568/1520 | 4.54 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 1086/1520 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 514/1291 | 4.54 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.75 | 1209/1483 | 3.75 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 3.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.42 | 461/1417 | 4.42 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 656/1405 | 4.25 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3.42 | 1351/1504 | 3.42 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.42 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 733/1519 | 4.83 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.83 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4.31 | 605/1495 | 4.31 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.23 | 1108/1459 | 4.23 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1460 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3.92 | 1144/1455 | 3.92 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 3.92 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 725/1456 | 4.46 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.38 | 418/1316 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.38 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1243 | **** | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1241 | **** | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/1236 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.59 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 411 1 |
| Title: | Fluvial Morphology |
| Instructor: | Miller,Andrew J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.60 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 18/32 | 4.50 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 28/31 | 3.00 | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.21 | 3.00 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 14/23 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 17/27 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.04 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.01 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 4 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 7 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 1 | General 0 | Under-grad 7 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 3 | D 0 | | Non-major 6 |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 | Electives 4 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 434 1 |
| Title: | Wildf Law & End Spec Act |
| Instructor: | Parker,Eugene P |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 140/1520 | 4.91 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 401/1520 | 4.64 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 139/1291 | 4.91 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.55 | 455/1483 | 4.55 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 76/1417 | 4.91 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.91 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 635/1405 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 999/1504 | 4.00 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 887/1519 | 4.73 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.73 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 239/1495 | 4.64 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.64 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1459 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1460 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1455 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1456 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.71 | 958/1316 | 3.71 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 3.71 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 235/1243 | 4.75 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 324/1241 | 4.75 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1236 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 434 1 |
| Title: | Wildf Law & End Spec Act |
| Instructor: | Parker, Eugene P |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 456/889 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 3 | Required for Majors | 5 Graduate 0 Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 6 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 C 1 | General | 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 10 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 F 0 | Electives | 4 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| 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 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 543/1520 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 667/1520 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 386/1291 | 4.67 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 324/1483 | 4.67 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 540/1417 | 4.33 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 656/1405 | 4.25 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 437/1504 | 4.50 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 852/1519 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 457/1495 | 4.43 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.43 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 680/1459 | 4.63 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 1048/1460 | 4.67 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 711/1455 | 4.44 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 746/1456 | 4.44 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 729/1316 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 235/1243 | 4.75 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 324/1241 | 4.75 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 544/1236 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 4.63 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 601/889 | 3.80 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 3.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| 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 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.19 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | 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 451 100 |
| Title: | Urban Sustainability |
| Instructor: | Neff,Robert |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| 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 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.54 | 568/1520 | 4.54 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 847/1520 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.31 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.38 | 713/1291 | 4.38 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4.23 | 821/1483 | 4.23 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 202/1417 | 4.69 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.69 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 433/1405 | 4.46 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 4.46 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4.38 | 594/1504 | 4.38 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 4.15 | 1377/1519 | 4.15 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.15 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 4.00 | 891/1495 | 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.62 | 696/1459 | 4.62 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 1012/1460 | 4.69 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.08 | 1042/1455 | 4.08 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.08 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 725/1456 | 4.46 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2.89 | 1246/1316 | 2.89 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 2.89 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 149/1243 | 4.88 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 770/1241 | 4.25 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 544/1236 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 4.63 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 456/889 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| 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 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.23 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.49 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.93 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.59 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.19 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.04 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.01 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 3.99 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 3.43 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 3.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| 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 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 2.94 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.28 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 480 1 |
| Title: | Adv Cartographic Appl |
| Instructor: | Rabenhorst,Thom |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 335/1520 | 4.71 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.44 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 485/1520 | 4.57 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 974/1291 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 138/1483 | 4.86 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.86 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 715/1504 | 4.29 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.29 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 288/1495 | 4.57 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.57 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1459 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1460 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1455 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1456 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1316 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1243 | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1241 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1236 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 44/164 | 4.50 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 108/165 | 4.00 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 480 1 |
| Title: | Adv Cartographic Appl |
| Instructor: | Rabenhorst,Thom |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 86/160 | 4.50 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/158 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.93 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 671 1 |
| Title: | Spatial Database I |
| Instructor: | Evans,Owen J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| 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 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 504/1520 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.33 | 809/1520 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 696/1291 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 1010/1483 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3.75 | 1040/1417 | 3.75 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3.50 | 1198/1405 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.24 | 3.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 503/1504 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.45 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4.45 | 1171/1519 | 4.45 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.45 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 306/1495 | 4.56 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.56 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 199/1459 | 4.91 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 544/1460 | 4.91 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 487/1455 | 4.64 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 541/1456 | 4.64 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 233/1316 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.86 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3.90 | 849/1243 | 3.90 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 3.90 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 807/1241 | 4.20 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 214/1236 | 4.90 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.90 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | 757/889 | 3.33 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.06 | 3.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 671 1 |
| Title: | Spatial Database I |
| Instructor: | Evans,Owen J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| 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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 20/164 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.15 | 3.66 | 4.80 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 41/165 | 4.60 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 3.75 | 4.60 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 100/160 | 4.40 | 4.78 | 4.45 | 3.91 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/158 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 3.59 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 59/150 | 4.33 | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.33 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 42/67 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.62 | 4.67 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/66 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.62 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 39/68 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.62 | 4.67 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 21/66 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 30/32 | 3.00 | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 23/31 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.39 | 3.67 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 21/23 | 3.67 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.56 | 3.67 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 21/27 | 3.67 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 3.67 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | 18/20 | 3.33 | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.52 | 3.33 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 19/24 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.13 | 3.67 |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.48 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 4.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 671 1 |
| Title: | Spatial Database I |
| Instructor: | Evans,Owen J |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| 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 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.90 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.68 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Bermudez,Luis E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 975/1520 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1347/1520 | 3.60 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1291 | **** | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1010/1483 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1225/1417 | 3.40 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 843/1405 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1355/1504 | 3.40 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 891/1495 | 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 1132/1459 | 4.27 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 806/1460 | 4.53 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.53 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1075/1455 | 4.13 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.13 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1094/1456 | 4.00 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 1019/1316 | 3.58 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.86 | 3.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | 903/1243 | 3.80 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 3.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 666/1241 | 4.40 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 852/1236 | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.06 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Bermudez,Luis E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 3.66 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 3.75 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 3.91 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 3.59 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.71 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.62 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.62 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.52 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.48 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 4.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Bermudez,Luis E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.90 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.68 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Ronald E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 975/1520 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1347/1520 | 3.60 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1291 | **** | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1010/1483 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1225/1417 | 3.40 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 843/1405 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1355/1504 | 3.40 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 351/1495 | 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 1132/1459 | 4.27 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 806/1460 | 4.53 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.53 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 761/1455 | 4.13 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.13 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | 991/1456 | 4.00 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | 927/1316 | 3.58 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.86 | 3.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | 903/1243 | 3.80 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 3.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 666/1241 | 4.40 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 852/1236 | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.06 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Ronald E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 3.66 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 3.75 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 3.91 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 3.59 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.71 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.62 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.62 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.52 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.48 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 4.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Ronald E |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.90 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.68 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Lieberman,Joshu |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 975/1520 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1347/1520 | 3.60 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1291 | **** | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.38 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1010/1483 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1225/1417 | 3.40 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 843/1405 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1355/1504 | 3.40 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | 1288/1495 | 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 967/1459 | 4.27 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1394/1460 | 4.53 | 4.82 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.53 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1075/1455 | 4.13 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.13 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | 1217/1456 | 4.00 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1106/1316 | 3.58 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 3.86 | 3.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | 903/1243 | 3.80 | 4.13 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 3.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 666/1241 | 4.40 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 852/1236 | 4.20 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/889 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.06 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: GES 773 1 | Term - Fall 2011 | Enrollment: 9 |
| Title: GIS Modeling Techniques | | Questionnaires: 9 |
| Instructor: Lieberman,Joshu | | |

| 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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/164 | **** | 4.80 | 4.15 | 3.66 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.67 | 4.19 | 3.75 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/160 | **** | 4.78 | 4.45 | 3.91 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/158 | **** | 4.92 | 4.36 | 3.59 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/150 | **** | 4.52 | 4.05 | 3.71 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.62 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.62 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | **** | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | 4.15 | 4.36 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | 4.04 | 4.23 | 4.52 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.48 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.07 | 4.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | GES 773 1 |
| Title: | GIS Modeling Techniques |
| Instructor: | Lieberman,Joshu |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| 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 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.90 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.68 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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