Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100		Term - Fall 2012										Enrollment: 192	
Title:	**Human Geography**												**Questionnaires: 84**	
Instructor:	**Steele,Christop**													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	26	37	15	3.71	1417/1589	3.86	4.41	4.32	4.20	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	23	31	22	3.77	1348/1589	3.94	4.30	4.29	4.28	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	18	31	24	3.77	1205/1391	3.96	4.34	4.34	4.29	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	8	25	29	16	3.58	1389/1552	3.71	4.22	4.25	4.16	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	7	17	23	31	3.89	1038/1495	3.83	3.96	4.14	4.07	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	10	15	26	21	11	3.10	1402/1457	3.30	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	5	8	22	45	4.30	787/1572	4.29	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	16	65	4.80	730/1589	4.59	4.71	4.66	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	2	26	31	8	3.67	1270/1569	3.78	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	8	27	46	4.37	1061/1530	4.49	4.66	4.49	4.45	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	11	70	4.80	889/1533	4.74	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	17	30	31	4.01	1165/1528	4.18	4.43	4.35	4.31	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	19	19	39	4.06	1147/1529	4.30	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	4	12	27	38	4.14	697/1393	4.17	4.24	4.06	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	****/1337	3.74	4.07	4.17	4.01	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	64	0	2	3	6	2	7	3.45	****/1331	3.63	4.27	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	****/1333	3.79	4.46	4.40	4.22	****
4. Were special techniques successful	63	15	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 192			
Title:	**Human Geography**						**Questionnaires: 84**			
Instructor:	**Steele,Christop**									

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	82	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	81	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	82	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	82	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	80	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	192
Title:	Human Geography		Questionnaires:	84
Instructor:	Steele,Christop			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	6	A	35	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	34						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	9	General	67	Under-grad	84	Non-major	83
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 102 200		Term - Fall 2012					Enrollment: 184					
Title: Human Geography							Questionnaires: 112					
Instructor: Bennett,Sari J												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	5	0	3	9	15	38	42	4.00	1182/1589	3.86	4.41	4.32	4.20	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	5	17	33	50	4.10	1092/1589	3.94	4.30	4.29	4.28	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	5	5	15	27	56	4.15	971/1391	3.96	4.34	4.34	4.29	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	4	10	23	28	39	3.85	1235/1552	3.71	4.22	4.25	4.16	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	6	11	23	26	39	3.77	1137/1495	3.83	3.96	4.14	4.07	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	9	13	27	27	28	3.50	1268/1457	3.30	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	6	0	13	26	61	4.28	801/1572	4.29	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	64	41	4.38	1240/1589	4.59	4.71	4.66	4.59	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	2	1	0	22	45	16	3.89	1089/1569	3.78	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	2	5	13	84	4.62	728/1530	4.49	4.66	4.49	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	3	4	8	89	4.69	1073/1533	4.74	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	6	5	3	23	68	4.35	883/1528	4.18	4.43	4.35	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	8	19	74	4.55	689/1529	4.30	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	4	4	18	18	59	4.20	629/1393	4.17	4.24	4.06	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	3	3	7	9	13	3.74	1027/1337	3.74	4.07	4.17	4.01	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	4	5	6	5	15	3.63	1192/1331	3.63	4.27	4.35	4.18	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	78	0	2	3	10	4	15	3.79	1129/1333	3.79	4.46	4.40	4.22	3.79

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 102 200		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 184			
Title: Human Geography										Questionnaires: 112			
Instructor: Bennett,Sari J													

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	78	12	3	3	4	3	9	3.55	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	31	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	35						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	17	General	66	Under-grad	112	Non-major	111
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	23						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment:	156
Title:	Physical Geography										Questionnaires:	103
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	2	27	35	35	4.01	1174/1589	3.99	4.41	4.32	4.20	4.01
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	6	18	34	42	4.12	1072/1589	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.28	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	8	30	58	4.41	719/1391	4.04	4.34	4.34	4.29	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	17	2	4	19	24	32	3.99	1102/1552	3.73	4.22	4.25	4.16	3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	17	25	54	4.28	663/1495	4.13	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	50	1	3	13	18	15	3.86	1033/1457	3.68	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	20	27	52	4.28	815/1572	4.25	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	14	86	4.86	572/1589	4.62	4.71	4.66	4.59	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	0	1	19	46	12	3.88	1098/1569	3.84	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	6	22	71	4.62	711/1530	4.51	4.66	4.49	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	3	92	4.87	671/1533	4.87	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	5	12	25	55	4.27	974/1528	4.18	4.43	4.35	4.31	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	9	24	61	4.37	883/1529	4.28	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	0	8	25	62	4.46	392/1393	4.39	4.24	4.06	3.99	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	3	12	16	23	3.98	843/1337	3.95	4.07	4.17	4.01	3.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	1	4	11	20	21	3.98	1007/1331	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.18	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	0	2	11	16	27	4.21	908/1333	3.92	4.46	4.40	4.22	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	46	34	5	3	6	2	7	3.13	****/1014	3.00	3.93	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	156
Title:	Physical Geography					Questionnaires:	103
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	96	5	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	96	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	95	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	96	3	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	96	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	96	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	96	4	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	4	1	1	0	1	2.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	97	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	97	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	97	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	97	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	98	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 156
Title:	Physical Geography			Questionnaires: 103
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	98	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	3	A	27	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	1	B	42						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	12	C	25	General	45	Under-grad	102	Non-major	97
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	14	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 75			
Title:	Physical Geography										Questionnaires: 62			
Instructor:	Jeffrey,Scott													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	21	24	3.97	1226/1589	3.99	4.41	4.32	4.20	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	8	9	23	21	3.89	1278/1589	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.28	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	13	23	16	3.68	1245/1391	4.04	4.34	4.34	4.29	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	30	2	3	10	12	5	3.47	1440/1552	3.73	4.22	4.25	4.16	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	5	10	16	25	3.98	923/1495	4.13	3.96	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	45	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1268/1457	3.68	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	5	8	16	31	4.22	899/1572	4.25	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	35	23	4.37	1240/1589	4.62	4.71	4.66	4.59	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	1	1	11	25	7	3.80	1170/1569	3.84	4.09	4.13	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	6	13	35	4.40	1016/1530	4.51	4.66	4.49	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	8	50	4.86	700/1533	4.87	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	3	7	24	21	4.09	1123/1528	4.18	4.43	4.35	4.31	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	4	6	17	28	4.20	1057/1529	4.28	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	6	19	29	4.32	521/1393	4.39	4.24	4.06	3.99	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	2	12	7	16	3.92	904/1337	3.95	4.07	4.17	4.01	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	5	11	8	13	3.71	1157/1331	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.18	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	3	4	9	10	12	3.63	1200/1333	3.92	4.46	4.40	4.22	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	24	22	3	4	3	2	4	3.00	944/1014	3.00	3.93	4.05	3.91	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 75
Title:	Physical Geography		Questionnaires: 62
Instructor:	Jeffrey,Scott		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 02			Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment:	75
Title:	Physical Geography											Questionnaires:	62
Instructor:	Jeffrey,Scott												

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	20	General	34	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 90
Title:	Env Science/Conservation			Questionnaires: 45
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	1	12	27	4.33	871/1589	4.32	4.41	4.32	4.20	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	10	27	4.33	853/1589	4.40	4.30	4.29	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	28	4.31	818/1391	4.37	4.34	4.34	4.29	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	0	4	8	24	4.37	718/1552	4.26	4.22	4.25	4.16	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	11	25	4.18	774/1495	4.16	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	4	2	4	3	13	3.73	1146/1457	3.86	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	6	31	4.47	555/1572	4.49	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	2	5	35	4.72	882/1589	4.79	4.71	4.66	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	3	22	11	4.16	804/1569	4.09	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	37	4.72	541/1530	4.75	4.66	4.49	4.45	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	2	39	4.86	729/1533	4.87	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	8	27	4.45	756/1528	4.50	4.43	4.35	4.31	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	2	6	31	4.59	639/1529	4.59	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	4	13	22	4.19	651/1393	4.35	4.24	4.06	3.99	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	9	4	13	3.96	863/1337	4.10	4.07	4.17	4.01	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	3	7	2	14	3.82	1113/1331	3.99	4.27	4.35	4.18	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	3	3	20	4.46	733/1333	4.53	4.46	4.40	4.22	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	17	16	1	3	1	5	2	3.33	891/1014	3.33	3.93	4.05	3.91	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 120 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 90
Title: Env Science/Conservation		Questionnaires: 45
Instructor: Ellis,Erle C		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	3	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	90
Title:	Env Science/Conservation				Questionnaires:	45
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	31	Under-grad	45	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	181
Title:	Env Science/Conservation		Questionnaires:	82
Instructor:	Holland,Margare			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	11	18	48	4.30	910/1589	4.32	4.41	4.32	4.20	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	20	52	4.46	674/1589	4.40	4.30	4.29	4.28	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	26	47	4.43	706/1391	4.37	4.34	4.34	4.29	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	1	13	23	32	4.15	954/1552	4.26	4.22	4.25	4.16	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	12	23	39	4.14	814/1495	4.16	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	4	9	19	22	3.98	908/1457	3.86	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.98
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	7	17	54	4.51	495/1572	4.49	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	69	4.85	598/1589	4.79	4.71	4.66	4.59	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	2	10	35	24	4.01	949/1569	4.09	4.09	4.13	4.08	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	10	67	4.78	452/1530	4.75	4.66	4.49	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	6	74	4.89	643/1533	4.87	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	7	18	52	4.55	632/1528	4.50	4.43	4.35	4.31	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	6	15	57	4.59	639/1529	4.59	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	4	21	48	4.52	332/1393	4.35	4.24	4.06	3.99	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	9	10	22	4.24	678/1337	4.10	4.07	4.17	4.01	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	2	10	9	21	4.17	899/1331	3.99	4.27	4.35	4.18	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	5	7	30	4.60	623/1333	4.53	4.46	4.40	4.22	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	40	24	1	3	4	3	7	3.67	****/1014	3.33	3.93	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 120 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 181
Title: Env Science/Conservation		Questionnaires: 82
Instructor: Holland,Margare		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	78	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	79	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	79	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	79	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 02		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment:				181
Title:	Env Science/Conservation								Questionnaires:				82
Instructor:	Holland,Margare												

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	37						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	13	General	40	Under-grad	82	Non-major	82
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 220 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Env Sci Lab & Field Tech			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	519/1589	4.60	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	540/1589	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	509/1552	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	6	2	8	4.13	824/1495	4.13	3.96	4.14	4.18	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	1	14	4.45	454/1457	4.45	4.04	4.15	4.14	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	13	4.30	774/1572	4.30	4.28	4.21	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	598/1589	4.85	4.71	4.66	4.63	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	534/1569	4.39	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	488/1530	4.75	4.66	4.49	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	872/1533	4.80	4.84	4.75	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	494/1528	4.65	4.43	4.35	4.35	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	852/1529	4.40	4.47	4.36	4.39	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	764/1393	4.07	4.24	4.06	4.13	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1331	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.32	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1007/1333	4.00	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 220 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Env Sci Lab & Field Tech									Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	40/180	4.60	4.30	4.20	4.50	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	33/194	4.73	4.26	4.17	4.12	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	46/178	4.80	4.61	4.47	4.63	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	42/181	4.73	4.42	4.40	4.55	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	49/165	4.43	4.23	4.12	4.42	4.43
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.06	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	3.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 220 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Env Sci Lab & Field Tech			Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 58
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	School,Joseph			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	10	15	4.38	819/1589	4.38	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	11	9	3.90	1272/1589	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.30	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	9	8	6	3.65	1255/1391	3.65	4.34	4.34	4.36	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	12	9	3.86	1227/1552	3.86	4.22	4.25	4.26	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	2	7	3	3	3.31	1388/1495	3.31	3.96	4.14	4.18	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	5	6	6	7	3.42	1303/1457	3.42	4.04	4.15	4.14	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	8	8	8	3.66	1339/1572	3.66	4.28	4.21	4.19	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	572/1589	4.86	4.71	4.66	4.63	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	5	9	8	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	5	18	4.38	1050/1530	4.38	4.66	4.49	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	700/1533	4.86	4.84	4.75	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	8	10	11	4.10	1112/1528	4.10	4.43	4.35	4.35	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	10	10	3.97	1204/1529	3.97	4.47	4.36	4.39	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	8	9	7	3.81	965/1393	3.81	4.24	4.06	4.13	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	9	3	3	3.35	1198/1337	3.35	4.07	4.17	4.16	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	948/1331	4.12	4.27	4.35	4.32	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	860/1333	4.29	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 58
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	School,Joseph			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	0	8	12	4.32	82/180	4.32	4.30	4.20	4.50	4.32
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	4	2	14	4.23	99/194	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.12	4.23
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	67/178	4.73	4.61	4.47	4.63	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	2	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	45/181	4.70	4.42	4.40	4.55	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	3	0	4	2	2	11	4.05	104/165	4.05	4.23	4.12	4.42	4.05
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	16/40	4.56	4.61	3.85	3.77	4.56
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	14/40	4.56	4.52	3.89	3.86	4.56
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	11/32	4.50	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	17/29	4.13	4.33	4.15	3.26	4.13
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	58
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View			Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	School,Joseph				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 01	Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 41			
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog									Questionnaires: 37			
Instructor:	Holland,Margare												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org 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	2	10	24	4.51	633/1589	4.61	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	24	4.43	719/1589	4.29	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	5	25	4.35	780/1391	4.46	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	24	4.49	540/1552	4.46	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	26	4.43	496/1495	3.85	3.96	4.14	4.11	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	4	25	4.35	569/1457	4.37	4.04	4.15	4.13	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	7	25	4.53	473/1572	4.66	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	768/1589	4.71	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	15	15	4.33	596/1569	4.13	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	399/1530	4.83	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1533	4.96	4.84	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	405/1528	4.68	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	23	4.54	689/1529	4.63	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	12	22	4.60	266/1393	4.34	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	408/1337	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	311/1331	3.66	4.27	4.35	4.35	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	177/1333	4.22	4.46	4.40	4.41	4.94

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	41
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog			Questionnaires:	37
Instructor:	Holland,Margare				

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	283/1014	4.43	3.93	4.05	4.04	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	37	Non-major	35
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 37
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Huemmrich,Karl			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1589	4.61	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1053/1589	4.29	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	517/1391	4.46	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	636/1552	4.46	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	4	3	1	3	3.27	1399/1495	3.85	3.96	4.14	4.11	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	533/1457	4.37	4.04	4.15	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	198/1572	4.66	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	974/1589	4.71	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1068/1569	4.13	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	311/1530	4.83	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	469/1533	4.96	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	509/1528	4.68	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	458/1529	4.63	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	758/1393	4.34	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1337	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1323/1331	3.66	4.27	4.35	4.35	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1231/1333	4.22	4.46	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	4.43	3.93	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 02		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	37
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog					Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Huemmrich,Karl						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 308 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 78				
Title:	Ecology								Questionnaires: 46				
Instructor:	Swan,Christophe												

				Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	17	21	4.29	929/1589	4.29	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	9	29	4.49	644/1589	4.49	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	34	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	889/1552	4.21	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	4	10	14	13	3.74	1160/1495	3.74	3.96	4.14	4.11	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/1457	****	4.04	4.15	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	13	27	4.47	555/1572	4.47	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	36	4.76	825/1589	4.76	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	10	22	6	3.89	1089/1569	3.89	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	10	34	4.73	523/1530	4.73	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	7	8	28	4.38	1367/1533	4.38	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	16	25	4.44	768/1528	4.44	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	12	28	4.51	726/1529	4.51	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	4	4	9	19	4.19	640/1393	4.19	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/1331	****	4.27	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1333	****	4.46	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 308 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	78
Title:	Ecology			Questionnaires:	46
Instructor:	Swan,Christophe				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	23						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 311 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 40
Title: Weather And Climate		Questionnaires: 35
Instructor: Mehta,Amita V		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	10	12	8	3.68	1436/1589	3.68	4.41	4.32	4.33	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	9	10	10	3.68	1414/1589	3.68	4.30	4.29	4.26	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	12	13	4.06	1027/1391	4.06	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	2	0	9	9	8	3.75	1301/1552	3.75	4.22	4.25	4.24	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	871/1495	4.06	3.96	4.14	4.11	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	4	2	3	10	5	3.42	1307/1457	3.42	4.04	4.15	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	4	8	6	13	3.73	1302/1572	3.73	4.28	4.21	4.18	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	0	1	20	10	4.19	1409/1589	4.19	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	3	11	7	3	3.32	1441/1569	3.32	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	11	16	4.21	1209/1530	4.21	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	9	21	4.47	1287/1533	4.47	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	12	9	11	3.82	1299/1528	3.82	4.43	4.35	4.33	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	7	8	13	3.82	1306/1529	3.82	4.47	4.36	4.34	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	6	8	11	3.93	888/1393	3.93	4.24	4.06	4.10	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	766/1337	4.11	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	788/1331	4.30	4.27	4.35	4.35	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	749/1333	4.44	4.46	4.40	4.41	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	25	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 311 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Weather And Climate		Questionnaires: 35
Instructor:	Mehta,Amita V		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 311 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	40
Title:	**Weather And Climate**				**Questionnaires:**	**35**
Instructor:	**Mehta,Amita V**					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	32
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 319 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 40
Title:	Watershed Sci. & Mgt.			Questionnaires: 26
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	806/1589	4.38	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1267/1589	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.26	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1038/1391	4.05	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	3	10	6	3.95	1133/1552	3.95	4.22	4.25	4.24	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	7	6	7	3.90	1019/1495	3.90	3.96	4.14	4.11	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	701/1457	4.24	4.04	4.15	4.13	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	3	9	3	5	3.38	1444/1572	3.38	4.28	4.21	4.18	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	730/1589	4.81	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	646/1569	4.29	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	951/1530	4.45	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	586/1533	4.90	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1283/1528	3.85	4.43	4.35	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	795/1529	4.45	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	2	0	3	6	5	3.75	1000/1393	3.75	4.24	4.06	4.10	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1331	****	4.27	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1333	****	4.46	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 319 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 40
Title: Watershed Sci. & Mgt.		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Baker,Matthew E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 319 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	40
Title:	Watershed Sci. & Mgt.			Questionnaires:	26
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 326 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 43				
Title:	Conservation Thought								Questionnaires: 32				
Instructor:	Parker,Eugene P												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	156/1589	4.91	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	292/1589	4.75	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	242/1391	4.81	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	27	4.75	238/1552	4.75	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	162/1495	4.78	3.96	4.14	4.11	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	24	4.66	258/1457	4.66	4.04	4.15	4.13	4.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	20	4.41	647/1572	4.41	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	844/1589	4.74	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	171/1569	4.77	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	350/1528	4.75	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	232/1529	4.88	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	4	7	16	4.20	629/1393	4.20	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1337	4.92	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	367/1331	4.77	4.27	4.35	4.35	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	202/1333	4.92	4.46	4.40	4.41	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	516/1014	4.08	3.93	4.05	4.04	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 326 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 43			
Title: Conservation Thought										Questionnaires: 32			
Instructor: Parker,Eugene P													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	5.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 326 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	43
Title:	Conservation Thought					Questionnaires:	32
Instructor:	Parker,Eugene P						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	28
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 330 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Geog Of Econ Development			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	341/1589	4.74	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	734/1589	4.42	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	271/1391	4.79	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	394/1552	4.61	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	109/1495	4.89	3.96	4.14	4.11	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	7	8	4.05	854/1457	4.05	4.04	4.15	4.13	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	473/1572	4.53	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	651/1589	4.83	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	272/1569	4.63	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	134/1530	4.95	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	614/1533	4.89	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	238/1528	4.84	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	351/1529	4.79	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	290/1393	4.58	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	6	4	3.92	904/1337	3.92	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	599/1331	4.54	4.27	4.35	4.35	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	603/1333	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.41	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 330 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	27
Title:	Geog Of Econ Development				Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 341 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 37
Title: Urban Geography		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Neff,Robert		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	713/1589	4.46	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	11	4.42	749/1589	4.42	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	363/1391	4.70	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	14	4.46	588/1552	4.46	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	764/1495	4.18	3.96	4.14	4.11	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	998/1457	3.90	4.04	4.15	4.13	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	160/1572	4.83	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	15	7	4.17	1423/1589	4.17	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	11	6	4.05	925/1569	4.05	4.09	4.13	4.10	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	523/1530	4.74	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	700/1533	4.87	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	449/1528	4.68	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	714/1529	4.52	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	854/1393	3.95	4.24	4.06	4.10	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	925/1337	3.91	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	961/1331	4.09	4.27	4.35	4.35	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	3	0	2	6	4.00	1007/1333	4.00	4.46	4.40	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	341/1014	4.33	3.93	4.05	4.04	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 341 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 37
Title: Urban Geography			Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Neff,Robert			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	147/180	3.78	4.30	4.20	4.08	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	81/194	4.33	4.26	4.17	4.05	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	124/178	4.33	4.61	4.47	4.42	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	91/181	4.50	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	68/165	4.33	4.23	4.12	3.94	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	19/40	4.45	4.61	3.85	3.93	4.45
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	19/40	4.36	4.52	3.89	4.16	4.36
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	15/32	4.40	4.41	4.30	4.48	4.40
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	9/29	4.55	4.33	4.15	4.15	4.55
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	14/21	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.25	4.18
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 341 01		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 37
Title:	Urban Geography						Questionnaires: 25
Instructor:	Neff,Robert						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 381 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 23
Title: Remote Sensing					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	995/1589	4.21	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1378/1589	3.74	4.30	4.29	4.26	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	9	6	4.06	1033/1391	4.06	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	6	9	4.17	943/1552	4.17	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1437/1495	3.00	3.96	4.14	4.11	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	7	6	3.79	1104/1457	3.79	4.04	4.15	4.13	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	959/1572	4.16	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	651/1589	4.83	4.71	4.66	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1357/1569	3.53	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	728/1530	4.61	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	1314/1533	4.44	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1294/1528	3.83	4.43	4.35	4.33	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1121/1529	4.11	4.47	4.36	4.34	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	3	2	3	7	3.75	1000/1393	3.75	4.24	4.06	4.10	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1051/1337	3.70	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1082/1331	3.90	4.27	4.35	4.35	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1069/1333	3.90	4.46	4.40	4.41	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	944/1014	3.00	3.93	4.05	4.04	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 381 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 23
Title:	Remote Sensing					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	156/180	3.57	4.30	4.20	4.08	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	7	1	5	3.64	167/194	3.64	4.26	4.17	4.05	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	118/178	4.38	4.61	4.47	4.42	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	164/181	3.75	4.42	4.40	4.31	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	3	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	125/165	3.73	4.23	4.12	3.94	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 381 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 23
Title:	Remote Sensing			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	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	17	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 386 01		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 28
Title: Intro Geog Info Systems				Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Tang,Junmei				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	929/1589	4.29	4.41	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1393/1589	3.71	4.30	4.29	4.26	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1212/1391	3.75	4.34	4.34	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1243/1552	3.83	4.22	4.25	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1420/1495	3.17	3.96	4.14	4.11	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1060/1457	3.83	4.04	4.15	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	616/1572	4.43	4.28	4.21	4.18	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1081/1569	3.91	4.09	4.13	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	434/1530	4.79	4.66	4.49	4.49	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1288/1528	3.85	4.43	4.35	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	1	7	3.85	1288/1529	3.85	4.47	4.36	4.34	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	221/1393	4.67	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1181/1337	3.40	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	861/1331	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.35	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.46	4.40	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 28
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	18/180	4.88	4.30	4.20	4.08	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	59/194	4.50	4.26	4.17	4.05	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	59/178	4.75	4.61	4.47	4.42	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	66/181	4.63	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	77/165	4.29	4.23	4.12	3.94	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 28
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei			

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****

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	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 20				
Title:	**Selected Topics In Geog**								**Questionnaires: 12**				
Instructor:	**Rivera,Megan W**												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	1047/1589	4.48	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1363/1589	4.19	4.30	4.29	4.35	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	4.78	4.34	4.34	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	943/1552	4.36	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1067/1495	3.85	3.96	4.14	4.25	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	829/1457	4.02	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	815/1572	4.54	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	467/1589	4.83	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1233/1569	4.05	4.09	4.13	4.22	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1016/1530	4.65	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	4.83	4.84	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1035/1528	4.48	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	852/1529	4.60	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	611/1393	4.16	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	601/1337	4.25	4.07	4.17	4.36	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1331	4.67	4.27	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1333	4.83	4.46	4.40	4.63	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	341/1014	4.33	3.93	4.05	4.32	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 20			
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog									Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor:	Rivera,Megan W												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.14	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.35	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Rivera,Megan W			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	4.23	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	3.85	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 28
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Weissberger,Eri			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	278/1589	4.48	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	433/1589	4.19	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	541/1391	4.78	4.34	4.34	4.46	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	457/1552	4.36	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	7	3	7	3.83	1086/1495	3.85	3.96	4.14	4.25	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	953/1457	4.02	4.04	4.15	4.30	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	176/1572	4.54	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	825/1589	4.83	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	546/1569	4.05	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	224/1530	4.65	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	1114/1533	4.83	4.84	4.75	4.76	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	350/1528	4.48	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	321/1529	4.60	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	743/1393	4.16	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	730/1337	4.25	4.07	4.17	4.36	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	766/1331	4.67	4.27	4.35	4.56	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	547/1333	4.83	4.46	4.40	4.63	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 400 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 28
Title: Selected Topics In Geog		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Weissberger,Eri		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1014	4.33	3.93	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 404 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment:	21			
Title:	**Forest Ecology**									**Questionnaires:**	**19**			
Instructor:	**Baker,Matthew E**													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	94/1589	4.95	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	614/1589	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	576/1391	4.53	4.34	4.34	4.46	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	286/1552	4.71	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	1028/1495	3.89	3.96	4.14	4.25	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1457	****	4.04	4.15	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	1005/1572	4.11	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	272/1569	4.63	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	610/1530	4.68	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	449/1528	4.68	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	572/1529	4.63	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	409/1393	4.44	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.36	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	989/1331	4.00	4.27	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	641/1333	4.57	4.46	4.40	4.63	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 404 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Forest Ecology			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/180	4.83	4.30	4.20	4.31	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	109/194	4.17	4.26	4.17	4.27	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	43/178	4.83	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/181	4.83	4.42	4.40	4.37	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	8/40	4.93	4.61	3.85	4.14	4.93
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	23/40	4.14	4.52	3.89	4.10	4.14
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	19/32	4.33	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	17/29	4.15	4.33	4.15	4.20	4.15
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 408 01			Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 24		
Title:	Field Ecology										Questionnaires: 22		
Instructor:	Swan,Christophe												

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	316/1589	4.75	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	511/1589	4.57	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	482/1391	4.60	4.34	4.34	4.46	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	436/1552	4.58	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	3	7	3.68	1203/1495	3.68	3.96	4.14	4.25	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	701/1457	4.24	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	6	4	8	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	280/1589	4.95	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	646/1569	4.29	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	787/1530	4.58	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	757/1533	4.84	4.84	4.75	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	869/1528	4.37	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	652/1529	4.58	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	731/1393	4.11	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1331	****	4.27	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1333	****	4.46	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 408 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Field Ecology					Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Swan,Christophe					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/180	4.86	4.30	4.20	4.31	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/194	4.71	4.26	4.17	4.27	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	70/178	4.71	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	30/181	4.86	4.42	4.40	4.37	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	13/165	4.83	4.23	4.12	4.09	4.83
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.14	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.35	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 429 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Sem Geog Disease/Health			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	223/1589	4.83	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	82/1589	4.94	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	109/1391	4.94	4.34	4.34	4.46	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	65/1552	4.94	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	169/1495	4.78	3.96	4.14	4.25	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	90/1457	4.89	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	113/1572	4.88	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	241/1569	4.67	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	259/1530	4.89	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	195/1528	4.89	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	349/1393	4.50	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	491/1337	4.46	4.07	4.17	4.36	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1331	4.92	4.27	4.35	4.56	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	325/1333	4.85	4.46	4.40	4.63	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	293/1014	4.40	3.93	4.05	4.32	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 429 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Sem Geog Disease/Health			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 451 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 20			
Title:	Urban Sustainability									Questionnaires: 15			
Instructor:	Neff,Robert												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	467/1589	4.60	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	320/1391	4.73	4.34	4.34	4.46	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	362/1552	4.64	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	383/1495	4.53	3.96	4.14	4.25	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	509/1457	4.40	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	329/1572	4.67	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	11	1	3.87	1549/1589	3.87	4.71	4.66	4.68	3.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	634/1569	4.30	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	523/1530	4.73	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	700/1533	4.87	4.84	4.75	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	479/1528	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	615/1529	4.60	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	1057/1393	3.67	4.24	4.06	4.18	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	400/1337	4.57	4.07	4.17	4.36	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	500/1331	4.64	4.27	4.35	4.56	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	399/1333	4.79	4.46	4.40	4.63	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	216/1014	4.57	3.93	4.05	4.32	4.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 451 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Urban Sustainability			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Neff,Robert				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	36/62	4.60	4.29	4.46	4.56	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	45/65	4.30	4.28	4.43	4.54	4.30
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	27/63	4.50	4.08	4.29	4.31	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	38/61	4.40	4.28	4.47	4.49	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	34/61	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.12	4.30
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/39	5.00	4.81	4.00	4.43	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	7/22	4.75	4.75	4.12	4.38	4.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	22/33	4.20	4.68	4.42	4.51	4.20
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	13/19	4.25	4.38	4.44	4.23	4.25
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	3.85	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 480 02		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 7
Title:	Adv Cartographic Appl					Questionnaires: 4
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1391/1589	3.75	4.41	4.32	4.46	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	509/1552	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1407/1572	3.50	4.28	4.21	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1349/1589	4.25	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.76	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1529	5.00	4.47	4.36	4.44	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1066/1337	3.67	4.07	4.17	4.36	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	766/1331	4.33	4.27	4.35	4.56	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	547/1333	4.67	4.46	4.40	4.63	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	80/180	4.33	4.30	4.20	4.31	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	93/194	4.25	4.26	4.17	4.27	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/178	5.00	4.61	4.47	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	91/181	4.50	4.42	4.40	4.37	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 480 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 7
Title:	Adv Cartographic Appl		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	82/165	4.25	4.23	4.12	4.09	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 488 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 14			
Title:	Spatial Data & GIS Appl								Questionnaires: 10			
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	910/1589	4.30	4.41	4.32	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	467/1589	4.60	4.30	4.29	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	846/1391	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.46	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1552	4.78	4.22	4.25	4.37	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1425/1495	3.13	3.96	4.14	4.25	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	649/1457	4.29	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1572	4.90	4.28	4.21	4.28	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.09	4.13	4.22	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	644/1530	4.67	4.66	4.49	4.56	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1100/1533	4.67	4.84	4.75	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	768/1528	4.44	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	1121/1529	4.11	4.47	4.36	4.44	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	290/1393	4.57	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1021/1337	3.75	4.07	4.17	4.36	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	379/1331	4.75	4.27	4.35	4.56	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	702/1333	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.63	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.93	4.05	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 488 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	14
Title:	Spatial Data & GIS Appl		Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 601 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title: Intro To Ges		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Miller,Andrew J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	871/1589	4.33	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1063/1589	4.13	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.34	4.34	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	509/1552	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	683/1495	4.27	3.96	4.14	4.18	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	593/1457	4.33	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	4	2	0	4	3.00	1509/1572	3.00	4.28	4.21	4.29	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	572/1589	4.87	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1312/1569	3.62	4.09	4.13	4.18	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	887/1530	4.50	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	586/1533	4.91	4.84	4.75	4.82	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	756/1528	4.45	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	893/1529	4.36	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	467/1393	4.38	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	379/1337	4.60	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	436/1331	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	503/1333	4.70	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	244/1014	4.50	3.93	4.05	4.13	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 601 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	15
Title:	Intro To Ges					Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 670 1					Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 14	
Title:	Adv Seminar in GIS												Questionnaires: 12	
Instructor:	Villiger,Erwin													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.41	4.32	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1589	4.75	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1391	4.25	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	847/1552	4.25	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	416/1495	4.50	3.96	4.14	4.18	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	400/1457	4.50	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	843/1572	4.25	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1589	4.75	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	488/1530	4.75	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1528	4.75	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1529	5.00	4.47	4.36	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1393	5.00	4.24	4.06	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	337/1337	4.67	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	478/1331	4.67	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.46	4.40	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	180/1014	4.67	3.93	4.05	4.13	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 670 1	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 14
Title: Adv Seminar in GIS		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Villiger,Erwin		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 670 1		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 14
Title:	Adv Seminar in GIS				Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Villiger,Erwin				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 671 1	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Spatial Database I			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	317/1589	4.73	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	653/1391	4.47	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	837/1552	4.27	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	3	9	4.21	733/1495	4.21	3.96	4.14	4.18	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	795/1457	4.13	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	462/1572	4.53	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1011/1589	4.60	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	902/1569	4.08	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	434/1530	4.79	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	907/1533	4.79	4.84	4.75	4.82	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	434/1528	4.69	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	558/1529	4.64	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	0	1	10	4.14	697/1393	4.14	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	446/1331	4.69	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	514/1333	4.69	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	429/1014	4.20	3.93	4.05	4.13	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 671 1	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 18
Title: Spatial Database I		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Evans,Owen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	100/180	4.17	4.30	4.20	4.40	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	149/194	3.83	4.26	4.17	4.15	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	135/178	4.17	4.61	4.47	4.63	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	55/181	4.67	4.42	4.40	4.38	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	53/165	4.40	4.23	4.12	4.43	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	37/62	4.50	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	15/39	4.75	4.81	4.00	4.10	4.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	10/22	4.50	4.75	4.12	4.54	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/33	5.00	4.68	4.42	4.63	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 671 1	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 18
Title: Spatial Database I		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Evans,Owen J		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 679 2		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 3			
Title:	Professional Seminar										Questionnaires: 3			
Instructor:	De Cola,Felix L													

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1391	3.00	4.34	4.34	4.40	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1518/1552	3.00	4.22	4.25	4.30	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1307/1495	3.50	3.96	4.14	4.18	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1268/1457	3.50	4.04	4.15	4.30	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1509/1572	3.00	4.28	4.21	4.29	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1261/1533	4.50	4.84	4.75	4.82	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1409/1528	3.50	4.43	4.35	4.38	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	739/1529	4.50	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	349/1393	4.50	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1219/1331	3.50	4.27	4.35	4.51	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1231/1333	3.50	4.46	4.40	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	554/1014	4.00	3.93	4.05	4.13	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 679 2		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 3				
Title:	Professional Seminar								Questionnaires: 3				
Instructor:	De Cola,Felix L												

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	177/180	3.00	4.30	4.20	4.40	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	59/194	4.50	4.26	4.17	4.15	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	143/178	4.00	4.61	4.47	4.63	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	176/181	3.00	4.42	4.40	4.38	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	160/165	3.00	4.23	4.12	4.43	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	59/62	3.00	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	63/65	3.00	4.28	4.43	4.61	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	58/63	3.00	4.08	4.29	4.42	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	56/61	3.50	4.28	4.47	4.33	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	42/61	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/39	5.00	4.81	4.00	4.10	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 679 2		Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Professional Seminar				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	De Cola,Felix L				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/33	5.00	4.68	4.42	4.63	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 700 1			Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 7				
Title: Special Topics							Questionnaires: 7				
Instructor: Biehler,Dawn											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org 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	6	4.86	204/1589	4.86	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	734/1589	4.43	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.34	4.34	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	436/1552	4.57	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1495	5.00	3.96	4.14	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1457	4.71	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	598/1589	4.86	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	139/1569	4.83	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1095/1530	4.33	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	909/1528	4.33	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1142/1393	3.50	4.24	4.06	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	300/1337	4.71	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1331	4.71	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.46	4.40	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	891/1014	3.33	3.93	4.05	4.13	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 700 1		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 7
Title:	Special Topics								Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Biehler,Dawn								

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	25/62	4.86	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/65	4.83	4.28	4.43	4.61	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	17/63	4.80	4.08	4.29	4.42	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/61	4.71	4.28	4.47	4.33	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	52/61	3.43	4.18	4.19	4.22	3.43

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 770 1	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 9
Title: Spec Topics in Enterpris			Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Schlee,John W			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1534/1589	4.30	4.41	4.32	4.39	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1034/1589	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1061/1391	4.44	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1502/1552	3.65	4.22	4.25	4.30	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1420/1495	3.35	3.96	4.14	4.18	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1386/1457	3.72	4.04	4.15	4.30	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	735/1572	4.53	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1500/1589	4.67	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1508/1569	3.46	4.09	4.13	4.18	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	887/1530	4.74	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	786/1533	4.83	4.84	4.75	4.82	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	695/1528	4.65	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1406/1529	4.22	4.47	4.36	4.38	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	435/1393	4.26	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1066/1337	3.98	4.07	4.17	4.29	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	899/1331	4.25	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1007/1333	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	891/1014	3.64	3.93	4.05	4.13	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 770 1		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 9			
Title:	Spec Topics in Enterpris										Questionnaires: 9			
Instructor:	Schlee,John W													

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 770 2	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 16
Title: Spec Topics in Enterpris		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Abdullah,Qassim		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1589	4.30	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	400/1589	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	402/1391	4.44	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1202/1552	3.65	4.22	4.25	4.30	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1337/1495	3.35	3.96	4.14	4.18	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	886/1457	3.72	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	368/1572	4.53	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1589	4.67	4.71	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	2	3.89	1098/1569	3.46	4.09	4.13	4.18	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1530	4.74	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1533	4.83	4.84	4.75	4.82	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	322/1528	4.65	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	530/1529	4.22	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	467/1393	4.26	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	745/1337	3.98	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	802/1331	4.25	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1333	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	686/1014	3.64	3.93	4.05	4.13	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 770 2			Term - Fall 2012					Enrollment:	16			
Title:	Spec Topics in Enterpris								Questionnaires:	11			
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 770 2		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment:	16
Title:	Spec Topics in Enterpris										Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim											

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 770 2		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment:	16			
Title:	Spec Topics in Enterpris									Questionnaires:	11			
Instructor:	May,Nora C													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1589	4.30	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	400/1589	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	402/1391	4.44	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1202/1552	3.65	4.22	4.25	4.30	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1337/1495	3.35	3.96	4.14	4.18	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	886/1457	3.72	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	368/1572	4.53	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1589	4.67	4.71	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1367/1569	3.46	4.09	4.13	4.18	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	559/1530	4.74	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1100/1533	4.83	4.84	4.75	4.82	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1528	4.65	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	739/1529	4.22	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	796/1393	4.26	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	745/1337	3.98	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	802/1331	4.25	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1333	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	686/1014	3.64	3.93	4.05	4.13	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 770 2	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 16
Title: Spec Topics in Enterpris		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: May,Nora C		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 770 2		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 16		
Title:	Spec Topics in Enterpris								Questionnaires: 11		
Instructor:	May,Nora C										

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.38	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.50	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 774 1	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 13
Title: Spatial Statistics		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Wilson,Ronald E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1589	4.78	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	292/1589	4.75	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1391	4.88	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	121/1552	4.89	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	291/1495	4.63	3.96	4.14	4.18	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	105/1457	4.86	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	121/1572	4.88	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	519/1589	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1569	4.89	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	488/1530	4.75	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	350/1528	4.75	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	349/1393	4.50	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1337	4.57	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	696/1331	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1333	4.71	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	823/1014	3.50	3.93	4.05	4.13	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 774 1	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 13
Title:	Spatial Statistics		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Wilson,Ronald E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.30	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.26	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.61	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.42	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.23	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.29	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	4.28	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.28	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.61	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	4.52	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	4.81	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.12	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 774 1	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	13
Title:	Spatial Statistics			Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Wilson,Ronald E				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.68	4.42	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 775 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 6
Title:	Adv. GIS App. Developmen					Questionnaires: 6
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1047/1589	4.17	4.41	4.32	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.34	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	900/1552	4.20	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1153/1495	3.75	3.96	4.14	4.18	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1457	****	4.04	4.15	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	735/1572	4.33	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1213/1589	4.40	4.71	4.66	4.79	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	369/1569	4.50	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.83	4.66	4.49	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.84	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	570/1528	4.60	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.47	4.36	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	266/1393	4.60	4.24	4.06	3.91	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1271/1337	3.00	4.07	4.17	4.29	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	824/1331	4.25	4.27	4.35	4.51	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1333	4.25	4.46	4.40	4.51	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	554/1014	4.00	3.93	4.05	4.13	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 775 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 6				
Title:	Adv. GIS App. Developmen									Questionnaires: 6				
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/180	5.00	4.30	4.20	4.40	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	121/194	4.00	4.26	4.17	4.15	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/178	5.00	4.61	4.47	4.63	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/181	4.50	4.42	4.40	4.38	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/165	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.43	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	37/62	4.50	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/65	5.00	4.28	4.43	4.61	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	46/63	4.00	4.08	4.29	4.42	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	34/61	4.50	4.28	4.47	4.33	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/61	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/40	4.50	4.61	3.85	4.75	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/40	5.00	4.52	3.89	4.83	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.41	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/29	4.50	4.33	4.15	4.17	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.18	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/39	4.50	4.81	4.00	4.10	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/22	5.00	4.75	4.12	4.54	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/33	4.50	4.68	4.42	4.63	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 775 01	**Term - Fall 2012**		**Enrollment: 6**
Title: Adv. GIS App. Developmen			**Questionnaires: 6**
Instructor: Yang,Xiuzhu			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/19	4.50	4.38	4.44	4.06	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/16	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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