

Course-Section: GES 102 100
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Biehler, Dawn
 Enrollment: 160
 Questionnaires: 85

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 776
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	21	54	4.49	598/1447	4.34	4.49	4.31	4.18	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	19	60	4.63	389/1447	4.48	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	17	61	4.64	404/1241	4.55	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	38	1	2	4	12	28	4.36	655/1402	4.29	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	9	2	9	12	49	4.11	736/1358	3.82	3.94	4.11	4.03	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	54	0	0	7	6	16	4.31	564/1316	4.08	4.18	4.14	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	11	67	4.65	292/1427	4.59	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	3	5	75	4.87	592/1447	4.53	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	1	6	33	32	4.33	540/1434	4.30	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	73	4.85	276/1387	4.65	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	9	73	4.87	630/1387	4.80	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	6	72	4.83	229/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	8	68	4.67	448/1380	4.69	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	7	12	61	4.63	211/1193	4.47	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	2	4	6	17	4.10	675/1172	4.30	4.19	4.15	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	54	0	2	2	4	4	19	4.16	788/1182	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	2	0	3	4	22	4.42	648/1170	4.48	4.55	4.38	4.17	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	53	16	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	****/ 800	4.03	4.04	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	46	Under-grad	85	Non-major	82
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 102 101
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Unknown
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 777
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	954/1447	4.34	4.49	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	532/1447	4.48	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	541/1241	4.55	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	766/1402	4.29	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	690/1358	3.82	3.94	4.11	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	292/1316	4.08	4.18	4.14	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	459/1427	4.59	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	673/1447	4.53	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.30	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.65	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	982/1387	4.80	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.69	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	376/1193	4.47	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.30	4.19	4.15	3.95	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	856/1182	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.48	4.55	4.38	4.17	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.03	4.04	4.06	3.95	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	36	28	4.17	945/1447	4.34	4.49	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	33	32	4.23	882/1447	4.48	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	19	48	4.45	599/1241	4.55	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	38	1	1	6	7	21	4.28	745/1402	4.29	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	6	4	21	12	24	3.66	1091/1358	3.82	3.94	4.11	4.03	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	53	2	2	4	5	8	3.71	1020/1316	4.08	4.18	4.14	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	14	57	4.67	283/1427	4.59	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	52	23	4.31	1223/1447	4.53	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	1	4	30	18	4.23	668/1434	4.30	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	9	25	38	4.37	941/1387	4.65	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	69	4.92	475/1387	4.80	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	9	24	41	4.43	705/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	15	50	4.54	615/1380	4.69	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	11	21	39	4.36	401/1193	4.47	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	3	1	5	13	22	4.14	654/1172	4.30	4.19	4.15	3.95	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	2	3	4	10	25	4.20	760/1182	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	2	1	12	29	4.55	554/1170	4.48	4.55	4.38	4.17	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	32	16	5	1	5	6	10	3.56	642/ 800	4.03	4.04	4.06	3.95	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	73	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	73	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	73	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	23	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	46	Under-grad	75	Non-major	74
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	5	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 102 300
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Luna,Ronald W
 Enrollment: 145
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 779
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	7	16	66	4.54	551/1447	4.34	4.49	4.31	4.18	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	21	65	4.58	447/1447	4.48	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	9	15	68	4.61	439/1241	4.55	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	2	3	5	6	29	4.27	756/1402	4.29	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	37	12	5	12	3	23	3.36	1223/1358	3.82	3.94	4.11	4.03	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	66	4	1	7	1	13	3.69	1032/1316	4.08	4.18	4.14	3.99	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	4	8	12	67	4.52	434/1427	4.59	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	6	65	20	4.13	1316/1447	4.53	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	1	2	0	9	26	32	4.25	645/1434	4.30	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	6	10	72	4.72	490/1387	4.65	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	6	9	74	4.76	844/1387	4.80	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	7	13	68	4.66	431/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	1	5	12	67	4.71	406/1380	4.69	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	4	7	17	57	4.49	296/1193	4.47	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	1	4	7	28	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.19	4.15	3.95	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	1	3	10	4	27	4.18	781/1182	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	2	2	6	6	29	4.29	745/1170	4.48	4.55	4.38	4.17	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	52	22	5	1	4	3	9	3.45	****/ 800	4.03	4.04	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	4	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	88	0	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	88	2	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	89	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 187	****	4.43	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	89	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 168	****	4.25	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	87	3	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	2	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	89	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	89	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	89	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	89	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: GES 102 300
 Title Human Geography
 Instructor: Luna, Ronald W
 Enrollment: 145
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 779
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	27	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	39						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	41	Under-grad	96	Non-major	96
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	16	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	4	12	21	22	3.93	1128/1447	3.89	4.49	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	7	9	17	28	4.03	1035/1447	4.09	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	10	13	36	4.31	743/1241	4.31	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	36	1	3	4	5	13	4.00	976/1402	4.07	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	5	8	9	14	19	3.62	1118/1358	3.53	3.94	4.11	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	42	2	4	2	4	7	3.53	1124/1316	3.76	4.18	4.14	3.99	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	13	9	34	4.16	866/1427	4.34	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	2	3	9	45	4.58	1030/1447	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	4	13	23	7	3.65	1162/1434	3.73	4.22	4.10	4.10	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	4	6	19	32	4.30	1007/1387	4.40	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	3	1	18	38	4.52	1134/1387	4.62	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	5	10	17	27	4.07	1022/1386	4.23	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	6	9	11	32	4.08	1003/1380	4.04	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	4	5	18	30	4.13	583/1193	4.17	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	6	1	6	6	9	3.39	1026/1172	3.50	4.19	4.15	3.95	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	3	3	8	5	9	3.50	1078/1182	3.46	4.38	4.35	4.18	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	3	1	8	5	11	3.71	998/1170	3.80	4.55	4.38	4.17	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	36	22	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.43	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.25	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: GES 110 100
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Lewis, Laurajean
 Enrollment: 136
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 780
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	23						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	18	General	32	Under-grad	64	Non-major	64
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 110 100
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Baker,Matthew (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 150
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 781
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	4	4	11	17	23	3.86	1190/1447	3.89	4.49	4.31	4.18	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	3	9	16	28	4.12	974/1447	4.09	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	6	22	29	4.31	743/1241	4.31	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	32	1	0	8	4	14	4.11	900/1402	4.07	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	7	6	11	12	17	3.49	1174/1358	3.53	3.94	4.11	4.03	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	41	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	921/1316	3.76	4.18	4.14	3.99	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	3	4	12	38	4.43	554/1427	4.34	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	1	3	6	46	4.67	958/1447	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	51	0	0	2	5	4	1	3.33	****/1434	3.73	4.22	4.10	4.10	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	1	12	27	4.59	684/1387	4.40	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	732/1387	4.62	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	748/1386	4.23	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	2	2	4	9	22	4.21	934/1380	4.04	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	1	2	0	7	9	18	4.14	583/1193	4.17	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	4	0	5	10	6	3.56	974/1172	3.50	4.19	4.15	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	4	2	6	5	8	3.44	1094/1182	3.46	4.38	4.35	4.18	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	3	0	5	7	10	3.84	962/1170	3.80	4.55	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	38	19	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	22
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	4
			Required for Majors	13	Graduate
			General	32	Under-grad
			Electives	4	63
			Other	3	Non-major
					0
					63
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	4	4	11	17	23	3.86	1190/1447	3.89	4.49	4.31	4.18	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	3	9	16	28	4.12	974/1447	4.09	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	6	22	29	4.31	743/1241	4.31	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	32	1	0	8	4	14	4.11	900/1402	4.07	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	7	6	11	12	17	3.49	1174/1358	3.53	3.94	4.11	4.03	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	41	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	921/1316	3.76	4.18	4.14	3.99	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	3	4	12	38	4.43	554/1427	4.34	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	1	3	6	46	4.67	958/1447	4.64	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	3	1	0	10	15	7	3.82	1045/1434	3.73	4.22	4.10	4.10	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	44	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	990/1387	4.40	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	44	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	1125/1387	4.62	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	44	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	911/1386	4.23	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	44	0	2	2	2	4	9	3.84	1133/1380	4.04	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	45	1	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	493/1193	4.17	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	4	0	5	10	6	3.56	974/1172	3.50	4.19	4.15	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	4	2	6	5	8	3.44	1094/1182	3.46	4.38	4.35	4.18	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	3	0	5	7	10	3.84	962/1170	3.80	4.55	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	38	19	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 22			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 13	General 32	Under-grad 63	Non-major 63
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	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 3		
				? 4			

Course-Section: GES 110 201
 Title Physical Geography
 Instructor: Unknown
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 783
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 120 1
 Title Env Science/Conservati
 Instructor: Parker, Eugene P
 Enrollment: 160
 Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 784
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	7	19	80	4.64	441/1447	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.18	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	10	21	77	4.62	401/1447	4.62	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	9	20	78	4.62	427/1241	4.62	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	66	1	1	5	10	23	4.32	695/1402	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	25	12	9	19	13	28	3.44	1195/1358	3.44	3.94	4.11	4.03	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	81	4	1	2	6	13	3.88	****/1316	****	4.18	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	3	9	20	74	4.56	398/1427	4.56	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	95	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	1	1	12	22	51	4.39	466/1434	4.39	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	13	90	4.84	307/1387	4.84	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	104	4.97	159/1387	4.97	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	5	19	79	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	7	94	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	3	20	23	49	4.18	545/1193	4.18	4.34	4.02	3.99	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	3	0	8	7	21	4.10	672/1172	4.10	4.19	4.15	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	612/1182	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	0	0	2	7	30	4.72	440/1170	4.72	4.55	4.38	4.17	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	72	27	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	107	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	107	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	107	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	107	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.43	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	107	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.25	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	106	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	106	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	106	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	107	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	107	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	108	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	108	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	108	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	108	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	108	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	108	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	108	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: GES 120 1
 Title Env Science/Conservati
 Instructor: Parker, Eugene P
 Enrollment: 160
 Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 784
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	46						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	21	General	51	Under-grad	110	Non-major	108
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	19	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	479/1447	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.55	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	603/1402	4.41	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	3.94	4.11	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	700/1316	4.17	4.18	4.14	4.08	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	191/1427	4.76	4.37	4.19	4.14	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.70	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	712/1434	4.19	4.22	4.10	3.97	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	596/1387	4.65	4.63	4.46	4.42	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	303/1386	4.76	4.54	4.32	4.24	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	571/1380	4.59	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	526/1193	4.20	4.34	4.02	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	****	4.19	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	4.55	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	34/ 189	4.81	4.63	4.34	4.47	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	13/ 192	4.94	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.81	4.48	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	35/ 187	4.81	4.43	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	34/ 168	4.63	4.25	4.20	4.15	4.63
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors		18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	474/1447	4.63	4.49	4.31	4.31	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	911/1447	4.23	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	861/1241	4.07	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	685/1402	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1358	3.40	3.94	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	812/1316	4.06	4.18	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1110/1427	3.70	4.37	4.19	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	978/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.70	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	754/1434	4.00	4.22	4.10	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	656/1387	4.49	4.63	4.46	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	4.88	4.90	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	871/1386	4.26	4.54	4.32	4.24	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	549/1380	4.30	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	455/1193	4.57	4.34	4.02	4.04	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	463/1172	4.40	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.55	4.38	4.32	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.44	4.63	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	4.44	4.47	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.89	4.81	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.56	4.43	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	3.33	4.25	4.20	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 1						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	408/1447	4.63	4.49	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	843/1447	4.23	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	923/1241	4.07	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	635/1402	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1212/1358	3.40	3.94	4.11	4.12	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	748/1316	4.06	4.18	4.14	4.08	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	8	2	4	3.53	1249/1427	3.70	4.37	4.19	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	868/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.70	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1017/1434	4.00	4.22	4.10	3.97	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	931/1387	4.49	4.63	4.46	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	859/1387	4.88	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	879/1386	4.26	4.54	4.32	4.24	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1030/1380	4.30	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	82/1193	4.57	4.34	4.02	4.04	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1172	4.40	4.19	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1182	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1170	4.60	4.55	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	96/ 189	4.44	4.63	4.34	4.47	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	100/ 192	4.44	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 186	4.89	4.81	4.48	4.57	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	93/ 187	4.56	4.43	4.33	4.46	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	3	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	160/ 168	3.33	4.25	4.20	4.15	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General		1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1							
				I	0	Other		0				

Course-Section: GES 302 100
 Title Selected Topics In Geo
 Instructor: Baker,Matthew E
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 788
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	201/1447	4.74	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	619/1447	4.52	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	496/1241	4.74	4.55	4.33	4.33	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	766/1402	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	8	3	7	3.94	869/1358	4.18	3.94	4.11	4.10	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	785/1316	4.18	4.18	4.14	4.13	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	373/1427	4.56	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1079/1447	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	386/1434	4.46	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	291/1387	4.84	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	317/1387	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	539/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1380	4.96	4.53	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	217/1193	4.63	4.34	4.02	4.05	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	428/1172	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.24	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	604/1182	4.48	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170	4.79	4.55	4.38	4.49	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	630/ 800	3.85	4.04	4.06	4.12	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	452/1447	4.74	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	436/1447	4.52	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	113/1241	4.74	4.55	4.33	4.33	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	518/1402	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	452/1358	4.18	3.94	4.11	4.10	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	572/1316	4.18	4.18	4.14	4.13	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	422/1427	4.56	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	397/1434	4.46	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	291/1387	4.84	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	211/1387	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	253/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	127/1380	4.96	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	193/1193	4.63	4.34	4.02	4.05	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	479/1172	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.24	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	540/1182	4.48	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	440/1170	4.79	4.55	4.38	4.49	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	407/ 800	3.85	4.04	4.06	4.12	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.43	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.25	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: GES 302 200
 Title Selected Topics In Geo
 Instructor: Ratcliffe, Micha
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 789
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 310 100
 Title Geomorphology
 Instructor: Miller, Andrew J
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 790
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	375/1447	4.69	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	16	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	272/1241	4.77	4.55	4.33	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	12	4.12	900/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	14	4.32	540/1358	4.32	3.94	4.11	4.10	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	7	11	4.21	662/1316	4.21	4.18	4.14	4.13	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	8	12	4.28	739/1427	4.28	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	13	7	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	755/1387	4.54	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	802/1386	4.35	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	19	4.46	699/1380	4.46	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	249/1193	4.56	4.34	4.02	4.05	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	660/1172	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.24	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	723/1182	4.29	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.55	4.38	4.49	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 26	Non-major 19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	25	4.69	386/1447	4.69	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	20	4.37	715/1447	4.37	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	8	20	4.29	750/1241	4.29	4.55	4.33	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	10	19	4.39	625/1402	4.39	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	6	21	4.35	507/1358	4.35	3.94	4.11	4.10	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	3	10	17	4.18	681/1316	4.18	4.18	4.14	4.13	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	5	24	4.43	568/1427	4.43	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	18	13	4.38	491/1434	4.38	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	30	4.83	322/1387	4.83	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	405/1386	4.69	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	406/1380	4.71	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	4	8	20	4.29	447/1193	4.29	4.34	4.02	4.05	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	8	10	4.37	496/1172	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.24	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	732/1182	4.26	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	640/1170	4.42	4.55	4.38	4.49	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	720/ 800	3.25	4.04	4.06	4.12	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.43	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.25	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: GES 342 100
 Title Metropolitan Baltimore
 Instructor: Bennett, Sari J
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 791
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 383 100
 Title Stat/Thematic Cartogrph
 Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 792
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	752/1447	4.38	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	468/1447	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	587/1241	4.47	4.55	4.33	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	807/1402	4.21	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	0	2	2	2	2.80	1325/1358	2.80	3.94	4.11	4.10	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1101/1316	3.57	4.18	4.14	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	554/1427	4.44	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	679/1434	4.21	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	140/1387	4.94	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	483/1386	4.63	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	193/1380	4.88	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	211/1193	4.63	4.34	4.02	4.05	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	683/1172	4.08	4.19	4.15	4.24	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	534/1182	4.54	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	559/1170	4.54	4.55	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	71/ 189	4.58	4.63	4.34	4.26	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	132/ 192	4.25	4.47	4.34	4.20	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	96/ 186	4.55	4.81	4.48	4.36	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	2	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.43	4.33	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.25	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	909/1447	4.21	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	891/1241	4.08	4.55	4.33	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	4	3.57	1138/1358	3.57	3.94	4.11	4.10	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	890/1316	3.93	4.18	4.14	4.13	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1150/1434	3.67	4.22	4.10	4.09	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.63	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1018/1386	4.07	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1159/1380	3.79	4.53	4.32	4.32	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.34	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1138/1172	2.75	4.19	4.15	4.24	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	988/1170	3.75	4.55	4.38	4.49	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 192	****	4.47	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.43	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 168	****	4.25	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	2.87	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.58	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 8
					Electives 3
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	626/1447	4.33	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	5	6	4	3.19	1379/1447	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.31	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.60	4.55	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	8	3.86	1107/1402	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.34	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	987/1358	4.18	3.94	4.11	4.15	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	763/1316	4.34	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	3	5	4	3.05	1358/1427	3.98	4.37	4.19	4.20	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	243/1447	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1162/1434	4.02	4.22	4.10	4.17	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	6	9	3.95	1202/1387	4.25	4.63	4.46	4.48	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1047/1386	4.17	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	3	9	3.71	1181/1380	4.19	4.53	4.32	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	940/1193	3.81	4.34	4.02	4.00	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	323/1172	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.25	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1182	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.49	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	522/1170	4.62	4.55	4.38	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	195/ 800	4.44	4.04	4.06	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	3	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	869/1447	4.33	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	993/1447	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.55	4.33	4.41	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	347/1402	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	608/1358	4.18	3.94	4.11	4.15	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	671/1316	4.34	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	656/1427	3.98	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	291/1447	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	812/1434	4.02	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1111/1387	4.25	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.98	4.90	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1087/1386	4.17	4.54	4.32	4.34	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	940/1380	4.19	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	628/1193	3.81	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	377/1172	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/1182	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.49	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1170	4.62	4.55	4.38	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	267/ 800	4.44	4.04	4.06	4.19	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.63	4.34	4.74	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.81	4.48	4.72	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 1	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	859/1447	4.33	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	766/1447	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.60	4.55	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	542/1402	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	387/1358	4.18	3.94	4.11	4.15	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	181/1316	4.34	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	422/1427	3.98	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1018/1447	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	540/1434	4.02	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	596/1387	4.25	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	539/1386	4.17	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	491/1380	4.19	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	3.81	4.34	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	710/1172	4.37	4.19	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	856/1182	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1170	4.62	4.55	4.38	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	4.44	4.04	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 406 100
 Title Aquatic Ecology
 Instructor: Swan,Christophe
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 797
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	540/1447	4.54	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	662/1447	4.42	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	599/1241	4.46	4.55	4.33	4.41	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	471/1402	4.52	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	12	7	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.94	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	5	9	5	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	247/1427	4.71	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	578/1434	4.30	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	180/1387	4.92	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.90	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	677/1386	4.46	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	406/1380	4.71	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	256/1193	4.55	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1172	****	4.19	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1170	****	4.55	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.04	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	118/ 189	4.29	4.63	4.34	4.74	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	137/ 192	4.18	4.47	4.34	4.61	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	122/ 186	4.44	4.81	4.48	4.72	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	129/ 187	4.21	4.43	4.33	4.59	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	131/ 168	3.87	4.25	4.20	4.53	3.87
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	19/ 38	4.75	4.92	4.49	4.68	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	15/ 36	4.42	4.58	4.25	4.42	4.42
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	5	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	23/ 28	4.29	4.76	4.52	4.72	4.29
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	4	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.38	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 1	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: GES 413 100
 Title Seminar In Biogeograph
 Instructor: Lewis,Laurajean
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 798
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	518/1447	4.56	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	633/1447	4.44	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	132/1358	4.81	3.94	4.11	4.15	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	519/1316	4.38	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.82	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	392/1386	4.70	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1380	4.73	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/1193	4.83	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	302/1172	4.64	4.19	4.15	4.25	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	373/1182	4.73	4.38	4.35	4.49	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1170	4.91	4.55	4.38	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.04	4.06	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 4
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GES 429 100
 Title Sem Geog Disease/Healt
 Instructor: Biehler,Dawn
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 799
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	281/1402	4.69	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	237/1358	4.67	3.94	4.11	4.15	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	283/1316	4.62	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	571/1380	4.58	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	350/1172	4.56	4.19	4.15	4.25	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.49	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.04	4.06	4.19	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 480 200
 Title Adv Cartographic Appl
 Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 800
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.34	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.80	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.19	4.15	4.25	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.49	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.51	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.63	4.34	4.74	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.81	4.48	4.72	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 187	5.00	4.43	4.33	4.59	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 168	5.00	4.25	4.20	4.53	5.00	

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

Course-Section: GES 485 100
 Title Field Research In Geog
 Instructor: Ellis, Erle C
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 801
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1231/1358	3.33	3.94	4.11	4.15	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1312/1427	3.33	4.37	4.19	4.20	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.19	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.04	4.06	4.19	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.92	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/ 36	4.33	4.58	4.25	4.42	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.76	4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	17/ 30	4.33	4.61	4.30	4.38	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.62	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	839/1447	4.29	4.49	4.31	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1447	4.43	4.41	4.27	4.31	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.55	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	709/1358	4.14	3.94	4.11	4.15	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	497/1316	4.40	4.18	4.14	4.27	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.37	4.19	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.22	4.10	4.17	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.90	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	358/1193	4.43	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.19	4.15	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.04	4.06	4.19	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	58/ 189	4.67	4.63	4.34	4.74	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	147/ 192	4.00	4.47	4.34	4.61	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.81	4.48	4.72	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.43	4.33	4.59	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.25	4.20	4.53	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.00	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	4.92	4.49	4.68	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.76	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.61	4.30	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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				

Course-Section: GES 491 130
 Title Ind Study Geog/Env Sys
 Instructor: Biehler,Dawn
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 803
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.41	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	3.94	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.37	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.63	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.34	4.02	4.00	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.92	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.58	4.25	4.42	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.76	4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.62	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: GES 602 100
 Title Research Methods/Ges
 Instructor: Baker,Matthew E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 804
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.55	4.33	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	690/1358	4.17	3.94	4.11	4.26	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.18	4.14	4.34	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.37	4.19	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.22	4.10	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1085/1387	4.20	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.43	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.53	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	843/1193	3.75	4.34	4.02	4.02	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.19	4.15	4.32	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.38	4.35	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.83	4.55	4.38	4.52	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.04	4.06	4.10	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.71	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.75	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.64	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	56/ 64	3.00	3.00	4.09	4.18	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 602 100
 Title Research Methods/Ges
 Instructor: Lewis,Laurajean (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 805
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.55	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	690/1358	4.17	3.94	4.11	4.26	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.18	4.14	4.34	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.37	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.22	4.10	4.21	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1085/1387	4.20	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.53	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	843/1193	3.75	4.34	4.02	4.02	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.19	4.15	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.38	4.35	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.83	4.55	4.38	4.52	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.04	4.06	4.10	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.75	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	56/ 64	3.00	3.00	4.09	4.18	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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