Course-Section: GES 102 0101

HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Title NEFF, ROBERT

Instructor: Enrollment: 81

Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 876 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NID	NA	Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions		INA								Mean		Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	10	23	4.33	902/1670	4.35	4.49	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	8	23	4.38	808/1666	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	7	24	4.28	852/1406	4.30	4.34	4.32	4.31	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	981/1615	4.06	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	3	5	9	15		1181/1566	3.85	4.07	4.07	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.15	4.12	4.00	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	7	28	4.59	457/1650	4.53	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 8	0	0	0	8	28 11	9 13	4.24	1374/1667 843/1626		4.58 4.14	4.67 4.11	4.61 4.07	4.24 4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	U	U	U	0	TT	13	4.10	043/1020	4.12	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	31	4.78	469/1559	4.71	4.59	4.46	4.47	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	35	4.89	621/1560	4.86	4.90	4.72	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	11	24	4.59	574/1549	4.60	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	6	27	4.57	643/1546	4.55	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	3	1	12	22	4.39	431/1323	4.22	4.35	4.00	3.91	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	683/1384	4.24	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	548/1378	4.31	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	470/1378	4.48	4.53	4.31	4.08	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	18	13	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	****/ 904	****	4.00	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory	2.0	0	0	•	-	•	0	2 00	****	als als als als	4 00	4 01	4 25	ale ale ale ale
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39 38	0 1	0	0 1	1	0	0		****/ 239	****	4.27		4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	Τ	U	Τ	U	U	U	2.00	****/ 230		4.71	4.44	4.58	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.63	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.25	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.85	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	4.30	4.19	4.07	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.24	4.27	4.42	****
Galfa Parad														
Self Paced	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 28	****	E 00	1 61	4 50	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38 38	1	0	0	1	0	U T		****/ 28 ****/ 16	****	5.00 4.00	4.64 4.67	4.59 4.83	****
2. Did study questions make crear the expected goal	30	Т	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 10		4.00	4.0/	4.03	
Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	า									

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре			
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	1	A :	 16	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-	•		

? 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: GES 102 0201

125

HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

BENNETT, SARI J

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 62

6

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

84-150

Grad.

Page 877 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

								cquc				1110	CIUCCOI	COULDO	DCPC	OTIDO	TC A C T	DCCC
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General Did you gain new insights, skills from this co Did the instructor make clear the expected go																	
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	2	10	13	36	4.36	862/1670	4.35	4.49	4.31	4.23	4.36
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	2	6	14	39	4.48	670/1666	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.48
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	1	12	15	33	4.31	823/1406	4.30	4.34	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	34	1	3	4	6	12	3.96	1143/1615	4.06	4.27	4.24	4.17	3.96
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	1	2	3	10	21	22	4.00	851/1566	3.85	4.07	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	4	43	0	4	2	3	6	3.73	****/1528	4.10	4.15	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	4	0	0	2	8	9	39	4.47	630/1650	4.53	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.47
8. How m	any times	was class cance	elled		5	0	0	2	0	1	54	4.88	730/1667	4.56	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	12	26	17	4.09	905/1626	4.12	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.09
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	3	0	1	1	2	10	45	4.64	706/1559	4.71	4.59	4.46	4.47	4.64
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	3	4	53							
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	15	39	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.60
		es contribute to			3	0	0	1	5	15	38	4.53	691/1546	4.55	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	3	4	2	5	8	14	26	4.04	681/1323	4.22	4.35	4.00	3.91	4.04
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ate to	what you learned	41	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	683/1384	4.24	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.24
				ed to participate	41	0	0	0	8	4	9	4.05	954/1378	4.31	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.05
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	41	0	0	1	6	1	13	4.24	877/1378	4.48	4.53	4.31	4.08	4.24
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	ssful	-	43	13	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 904	****	4.00	4.03	3.94	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				R€	eason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55	7 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 9 B 28		Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	rs 2	19	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 12		Ge	nera	1			1	1	Under-g	rad 6	52	Non-	major	60
	_		_	_									_					

Electives

Other

1

8

D 0

0

0

0

F 0

Ρ

I

?

Course-Section: GES 110 0101 Title

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA

Enrollment: 97 Questionnaires: 38

84-150

Grad.

1

3.00-3.49 1

3.50-4.00

D 1 F

P

I

0

0

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 878 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights, ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	1	3	8	9	15	3.94	1292/1670	4.06	4.49	4.31	4.23	3.94
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	4	0	0	4	3	8	19	4.24	991/1666	4.23	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.24
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	5	0	1	1	2	6	23	4.48	620/1406	4.39	4.34	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	5	7	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	861/1615	4.15	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	5	1	3	4	9	13	4.00	851/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.03	4.00
				to what you learne	d 5	8	1	3	6	9	6	3.64	1212/1528		4.15	4.12	4.00	3.64
		g system clearly		_	5	0	0	1	2	6	24		429/1650		4.46	4.22	4.28	4.63
		was class cance			4	0	0	0	2	22			1381/1667		4.58		4.61	
				ching effectivenes	s 11	1	0	2	6	12	6	3.85	1181/1626		4.14	4.11	4.07	3.8
		Lecture	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	4	0	0	3	3	5	23	4.41	1009/1559	4.52	4.59	4.46	4.47	4.41
		ctor seem intere			4	0	0	1	0	3	30	4.82	803/1560	4.85	4.90	4.72	4.68	4.8
				explained clearly	4	0	1	2	6	8	17		1095/1549		4.44	4.31	4.32	4.1
		es contribute to			4	0	2	1	2	7	22	4.35	899/1546		4.52	4.32	4.32	4.3
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				5	0	2	1	2	4	24	4.42	403/1323		4.35	4.00	3.91	4.4
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	2	1	4	6	6	3.68	1025/1384	3.86	4.27	4.10	3.92	3.6
				ed to participate	17	0	3	2	5	4	7		1203/1378		4.50	4.29	4.09	3.4
				nd open discussion	19	0	1	1	5	2	10	4.00	977/1378		4.53	4.31	4.08	4.0
		echniques succes			17		2	0	2	2	4	3.60	698/ 904		4.00	4.03	3.94	3.6
		Labora	tory															
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequat	te back	ground informatio	n 37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.27	4.21	4.35	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	assigned	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	***
		Field V																
				what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.85	4.50	3.91	***
2. Did yo	ou clearl	y understand you	ır eval	luation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.30	4.19	4.07	***
		Self 1																
2. Did st	tudy ques	tions make clear	r the e	expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	***
				Fre	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade					5			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		 Re	quir	 ed f	or M	 ajor	s 2	23	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B 15			_			,					0	,		2.0
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 3					Ge	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad 3	8	Non-	-major	38	

Electives

Other

2

3

Course-Section: GES 110 0201

Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW

Enrollment: 123
Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 879 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougstionn	aire
Student	course	Evaluation	ouest rom.	iaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	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	12	20	27	4.18	1071/1670	4.06	4.49	4.31	4.23	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	27	24		1015/1666		4.37	4.27	4.30	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	10	16	32		836/1406		4.34	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	2	3	4	9	17	4.03	1072/1615	4.15	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	10	16	27	4.20	706/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	5	7	8	14	3.83	1105/1528	3.73	4.15	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	15	42	4.63	395/1650	4.62	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	48	11	4.19	1416/1667	4.21	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	3	12	29	7	3.78	1233/1626	3.82	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	14	41	4.63	739/1559	4.52	4.59	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	54	4.88	647/1560	4.85	4.90	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	9	20	28	4.25	977/1549	4.19	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	6	6	16	32	4.23	1002/1546	4.29	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	7	16	35	4.38	439/1323	4.40	4.35	4.00	3.91	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	4	2	14	11	4.03	812/1384	3.86	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	3	4	9	15	4.16	906/1378	3.82	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	1	5	8	16	4.19	899/1378		4.53	4.31	4.08	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	30	21	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 904	3.60	4.00	4.03	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79		4.63	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80		4.25	3.97	3.99	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	А	22	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	5	Under-grad	61	Non-major	58
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 120 0101

Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI

PARKER, EUGENE

Instructor: Enrollment:

114 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 880 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	eque	ncie	:S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	3	0	1	0	5	11	51	4.63	518/1670	4.63	4.49	4.31	4.23	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	10	53	4.69	378/1666	4.69	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	4	13	50	4.63	459/1406	4.63	4.34	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	47	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	17	10	9	15	5	11	2.96	1492/1566	2.96	4.07	4.07	4.03	2.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	59	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	****/1528	****	4.15	4.12	4.00	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	4	10	51	4.60	429/1650		4.46	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	65	4.97	203/1667		4.58	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	4	15	37	4.59	339/1626	4.59	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	8	59	4.88	307/1559	4.88	4.59	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	65	4.97	179/1560	4.97	4.90	4.72	4.68	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	10	53	4.77	352/1549	4.77	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	60	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	8	17	39	4.43	393/1323	4.43	4.35	4.00	3.91	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	10	13	22	4.20	712/1384	4.20	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	2	13	7	23	4.07	947/1378		4.50	4.29	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	3	4	9	31	4.45	711/1378		4.53	4.31	4.08	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	26	33	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	****/ 904		4.00	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	3	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 232	****	4.43	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 239	****	4.27	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230		4.71		4.58	***
Field Work							•				4 0=			****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.85	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.30	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38		4.63	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	0	0	Ü	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.24	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16		4.00	4.67	4.83	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	69	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****
Frequ	ency.	, Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	23						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	6	С	15	General	11	Under-grad	70	Non-major	71
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				2	2						

Course-Section: GES 220 0101 University of Maryland Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE

Baltimore County

READEL, KARIN Instructor: Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 17

Page 881 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u dain ne	Genera. ew insights,ski:		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	708/1670	4.47	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.47
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	516/1666		4.37	4.27	4.27	4.59
		uestions reflect			0	13	0	0	0	0	4		****/1406		4.34	4.32	4.39	****
		uations reflect			1	6	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	446/1615		4.27	4.24	4.29	4.60
				what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	1	4		1029/1566		4.07	4.07	4.00	3.89
				to what you learned	0	7	0	0	5	1	4		1039/1528		4.15	4.12	4.11	3.90
		g system clearly			0	3	0	1	2	4	7		950/1650		4.46	4.22	4.20	4.21
		was class cance		arried	0	0	0	0	0	8	9		1142/1667		4.58	4.67	4.64	4.53
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	10		308/1626			4.11		4.63
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa.	II teat	ming effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	O	10	4.03	300/1020	4.03	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.03
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	858/1559	4.53	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.60
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.67
				our understanding	2	8	0	1	1	1	4	4.14			4.35	4.00	4.08	4.14
	Discussion																	
1 Did al	Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you learn				8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	242/1384	4.78	4.27	4.10	4.07	4.78
					8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	379/1378		4.50	4.29	4.25	4.78
	ere all students actively encouraged to participat id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				8	0	0	0	0	2	o 7	4.78	417/1378			4.29	4.25	4.78
		_		a open discussion	8	3	1	0	0	1	4	4.78	417/13/8		4.53	4.03	4.26	4.78
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succes	SSLUI		8	3	1	U	U	Т	4	4.1/	41// 904	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.17
		Labora	cory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding c	of the material	7	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 232	4.33	4.43	4.19	4.35	4.33
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	e back	ground information	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	38/ 239	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.33	4.80
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avail	lable f	for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	44/ 230	4.90	4.71	4.44	4.61	4.90
4. Did th	e lab ins	structor provide	assis	stance	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 231	4.90	4.61	4.31	4.52	4.90
		_		early specified	7	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	90/ 218					4.44
J	04411011101	_		Decorried	•	-	Ü	Ü	_	J	J		30, 220		1.23	1.10	1.23	
1 511 61	-1-1	Field V		3	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	 / 11	****	4 05	4 50	0.00	****
I. DIG III	era expe	rience contribu	le to w	hat you learned	16	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 41		4.85	4.50	2.00	
	1						trib	utio	n									
Crodita E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							P.O.	asons				Ψ.,	no.			Majors	
CIECUICS E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad												Ту 	 56			ма JUIS 	·
00-27	1	0.00-0.99					quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	rh
	P 0												respons				_	
	I O					O+1	her				1	.5					-	
						001					_	-						

Course-Section: GES 280 0101 University of Maryland Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 882

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

SCHOOL, JOSEPH Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	11	4.92	185/1670	4.92	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	238/1615	4.82	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1528	4.78	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	563/1626	4.40	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1323	4.70	4.35	4.00	4.08	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	Ο	1	0	1	1	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.27	4.10	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	548/1378	4.57	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 904		4.00	4.03	4.01	****
									, , , , ,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 232	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.35	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	85/ 239	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.33	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	4.71	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.61	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	39/ 218	4.75	4.23	4.18	4.25	4.75
Freq	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: GES 310 0101

38

GEOMORPHOLOGY

MILLER, ANDREW

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 34

Spring 2008

Page 883 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

0 1	a	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	2	7	9	15	4.12	1139/1670	4.12	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.12
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	8	7	17	4.21	1015/1666	4.21	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.21
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	2	2	12	17	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.34	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	3	1	1	6	10	12	4.03	1066/1615	4.03	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.03
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	10	15	4.09	796/1566	4.09	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.09
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	3	3	0	9	6	12	3.80	1122/1528	3.80	4.15	4.12	4.07	3.80
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	2	6	12	12	4.06	1101/1650	4.06	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.06
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	20	13	4.39	1263/1667	4.39	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.39
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	12	7	4.04	931/1626	4.04	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.04
		Lectur	9															
1 Were th	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	1	9	2	20	4 28	1136/1559	4.28	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.28
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	0	31	4.94		4.94	4.90	4.72	4.67	4.94
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	1	7	8	16		1010/1549	4.22	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.22
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	3	1	6	21	4.45	782/1546	4.45	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.45
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan						1	1	3	9	18	4.31	498/1323		4.35	4.00		4.31
3. 21d dd	410115441	. CCCIMIL MACO	ilalioo j	our under bounding	_	Ü	_	_	J			1.51	150, 1515	1.51	1.55	1.00	3.,,,	1.01
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	800/1384	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.08
				d to participate	22	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.30	4.50
		_		d open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.53	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		22	6	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 904	****	4.00	4.03	4.03	****
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	ıt i oı	n									
				11040	.01107	210	01 120											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.S			Typ	e			Majors	\$
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Required for Majors					s	5	Graduate		0	Majo		13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		Required for Major:					_		or adda o c	•	Ü	11000	_	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 8		Gei	nera:	l				5	Under-gr	ad 3	4	Non-	major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 3														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Electives						3	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
			P 0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	t		
I 0 Other										1	.7							

Course-Section: GES 314 0101

Title GEOGRAPHY OF SOILS

Instructor: HOLIFIELD, QUIN

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 884 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	5	6	19	4.09	1172/1670	4.09	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	6	21	4.39	796/1666	4.39	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	26	4.56	546/1406	4.56	4.34	4.32	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	6	4	20	4.24	886/1615	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	3	2	7	2	10	3.58	1241/1566	3.58	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	3	10	14	3.82	1105/1528	3.82	4.15	4.12	4.07	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	5	3	23	4.29	855/1650	4.29	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	15	17		1246/1667	4.41	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	3	9	12	4.07	915/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.07
<u>. </u>														
Lecture	0	0	1	2	4	1.0	1 -	1 06	1065/1550	1 00	4 50	1 10	4 40	1 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	4	10	15		1265/1559	4.06	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0 1	0 1	3	2 9	30 19	4.88	673/1560 900/1549	4.88	4.90	4.72	4.67 4.25	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	2		3						4.44	4.31		4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 2	1	∠ 3	2 1	4	6 10	20 14	4.25	987/1546 743/1323		4.52 4.35	4.32	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	Τ	3	Т	4	10	14	3.97	/43/1323	3.97	4.35	4.00	3.99	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	887/1384	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.12	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.50	4.29	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	470/1378	4.72	4.53	4.31	4.33	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	624/ 904	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.03	3.77
Laboratory							_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	2	0	0	0	2		****/ 232	****	4.43	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	0	1	2		****/ 239	****	4.27	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 230	****	4.71	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	1	0	0	1	2		****/ 231	****	4.61	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 218	***	4.23	4.18	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	26/ 41	4.78	4.85	4.50	4.44	4.78
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	18/ 38	4.56	4.30	4.19	3.96	4.56
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	2	0	0	0	3	4		****/ 38	****	4.63	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	14/ 39	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 31	****	4.53	4.47	4.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	20	-	U	U	U	J	۷	1.10	/ 31		1.33	1.1/	1.51	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	28	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	1	General	11	Under-grad	35	Non-major	26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: GES 341 0101

URBAN GEOGRAPHY

Title Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT

Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 885 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3 7	9	9		1294/1666		4.49	4.31	4.18	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33			4.34	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27					4.18	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	11	5	5		1348/1566		4.07	4.07	4.04	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	1	10	5		1088/1528		4.15	4.12	4.07	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	15	4.26	903/1650		4.46	4.22	4.12	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	7		1368/1667		4.58	4.67	4.67	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	15		4.09			4.14	4.11	4.06	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	1022/1559	4.41	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	829/1560	4.81	4.90	4.72	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	9	13	4.26	977/1549	4.26	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	17	4.44	795/1546	4.44	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	4	11	10	4.12	648/1323	4.12	4.35	4.00	3.99	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	11	9	4.26	664/1384		4.27	4.10	4.12	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57			4.50	4.29	4.30	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	541/1378		4.53	4.31	4.33	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	294/ 904	4.39	4.00	4.03	4.03	4.39
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	190/ 232	3.69	4.43	4.19	4.04	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	2	4	0	10	4.13	143/ 239	4.13	4.27	4.21	3.99	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	152/ 230	4.33	4.71	4.44	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	95/ 231		4.61	4.31	4.11	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	4	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	143/ 218	4.00	4.23	4.18	3.93	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 87		5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 79		4.88	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2				4.88	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 79		4.63	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 80	***	4.25	3.97	3.76	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	32/ 41	4.33	4.85	4.50	4.44	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	2	6	3	7	3.83	28/ 38	3.83	4.30	4.19	3.96	3.83
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	4	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	29/ 38	4.43	4.63	4.62	4.68	4.43
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	3	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	24/ 39		4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	27/ 31	3.80	4.53	4.47	4.51	3.80
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 28		5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 16		4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 27		5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	2	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 10		****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	****	****	4.92	***	****

Course-Section: GES 341 0101 Title URBAN GEOGRAPHY

Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 885 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	27	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 363 0101 University of Maryland Title WORLD REGIONS: CONT IS

Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 STEELE, CHRISTO Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Page 886

Enrollment:	36					
Ouestionnaires:	31	Stu	dent	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	5	a	15	A 10	1060/1670	4.19	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	6	10	10		1383/1666		4.37	4.27	4.18	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	12	10		1057/1406		4.34	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	4	1	2	10	7		1405/1615		4.27	4.24	4.18	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	Ω	19	4.39	,		4.07	4.07	4.04	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	3	3	9	4		1290/1528		4.15	4.12	4.07	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	2	15		1055/1650		4.46	4.22	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	9		1334/1667	4.30	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	7	13	6		1021/1626		4.14	4.11		3.96
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	_	O	U	,	13	O	3.70	1021/1020	3.70	1.11	1.11	1.00	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	8	12	10	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	911/1560	4.77	4.90	4.72	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	13	11	4.10	1108/1549	4.10	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	10	13	4.10	1106/1546	4.10	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	294/1323	4.57	4.35	4.00	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	599/1384	4.35	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	695/1378	4.42	4.50	4.29	4.30	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	541/1378	4.65	4.53	4.31	4.33	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	0	9	7	4	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.03	3.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	31	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: GES 383 0101 University of Maryland STAT/THEMATIC CARTOGRP

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Title Baltimore County Instructor: RABENHORST, THO Spring 2008

Enrollment: 9 Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 887

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 231 **** 4.61 4.31 4.11 ****

6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 218 **** 4.23 4.18 3.93 ****

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 253/1670 4.86 4.49 4.31 4.24 4.86 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 1 0 6 4.71 355/1666 4.71 4.37 4.27 4.18 4.71 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 0 5 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 1/1406 5.00 4.34 4.32 4.22 5.00 0 0 1 3 4.75 290/1615 4.75 4.27 4.24 4.18 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 0 0 3 3.60 1230/1566 3.60 4.07 4.07 4.04 3.60 2 0 1 3 3.83 1097/1528 3.83 4.15 4.12 4.07 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 0 6 4.57 471/1650 4.57 4.46 4.22 4.12 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 1347/1667 4.29 4.58 4.67 4.67 4.29 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $0 \quad 0$ 0 0 2 5 4.71 239/1626 4.71 4.14 4.11 4.06 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 Ω Ο 0 7 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.59 4.46 4.40 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 725/1560 4.86 4.90 4.72 4.67 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 424/1549 4.71 4.44 4.31 4.25 4.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 6 4.86 288/1546 4.86 4.52 4.32 4.24 4.86 0 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 137/1323 4.86 4.35 4.00 3.99 4.86 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 3 4.50 434/1384 4.50 4.27 4.10 4.12 4.50 1 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 603/1378 4.50 4.50 4.29 4.30 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 653/1378 4.50 4.53 4.31 4.33 4.504. Were special techniques successful 3 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 904 5.00 4.00 4.03 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 232 **** 4.43 4.19 4.04 **** 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 239 **** 4.27 4.21 3.99 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 230 **** 4.71 4.44 4.25 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0

Frequency Distribution

6 0 0

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

Course-Section: GES 386 0101 Title

INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 888 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			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	3	2	7	5	3.82	1400/1670	3.82	4.49	4.31	4.24	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	5	3	3.29	1573/1666	3.29	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1284/1406	3.47	4.34	4.32	4.22	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	1	4	7	3.81	1288/1615	3.81	4.27	4.24	4.18	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	6	3	3.29	1389/1566	3.29	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	1241/1528	3.58	4.15	4.12	4.07	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	855/1650	4.29	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	6	4	1	3.00	1534/1626	3.00	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	706/1559	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	929/1560	4.76	4.90	4.72	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	8	8	0	3.41	1426/1549	3.41	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	5	3	3.24	1446/1546	3.24	4.52	4.32	4.24	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	894/1323	3.80	4.35	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.27	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.50	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.53	4.31	4.33	***
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	***	4.00	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	107/ 232	4.31	4.43	4.19	4.04	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	189/ 239	3.77	4.27	4.21	3.99	3.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	87/ 230	4.69	4.71	4.44	4.25	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	156/ 231	4.08	4.61	4.31	4.11	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	143/ 218	4.00	4.23	4.18	3.93	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				2	1						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: GES 389 0101 University of Maryland Title GIS DATABASE DESIGN Instructor: TIRSCHMAN, JEFF
Enrollment: 6 Spring 2008

Ouestionnaires: 5

Page 889 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eguer	ncies	3		Inst.	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
General	_	_	_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.34	4.32	4.22	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.15	4.12	4.07	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.90	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	273/1323	4.60	4.35	4.00	3.99	4.60
5. Did addiovibual econniques emanee your anderseanding	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	,	1.00	27371323	1.00	1.55	1.00	3.,,,	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.27	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.50	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.53	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.00	4.03	4.03	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: GES 400A 0101 University of Maryland Page 890 AUG 6, 2008 SEVERE STORMS Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF Enrollment: 27

C+udon+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Title

Questionnaires: 23

Ceneral Cene									equer					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 18 4.74 388/1670 4.74 4.49 4.31 4.45 4.74 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 17 4.65 435/1406 4.57 4.37 4.72 4.35 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 2 1 1 18 4.14 1000/1615 4.14 4.27 4.24 4.37 4.14 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 0 2 12 6 6 3.91 1000/1666 3.91 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.17 3.91 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 5 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.57 4.73 4.14 5. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 5 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.57 4.73 4.32 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 9 10 4.45 499/1626 4.45 4.14 4.11 4.28 4.45 Lecture Lecture New ethe instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 0.0 11560 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 4.95 116/1546 4.95 4.52 4.32 4.38 4.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 2 0 4.95 116/1546 4.95 4.52 4.32 4.43 4.95 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 4.95 116/1546 4.95 4.52 4.32 4.43 4.95 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 0.0 178/1384 3.80 4.27 4.10 4.32 3.80 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 0.0 **** 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 Piscussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 0.0 **** 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 ***Exercise A. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 0.0 **** 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 ***Exercise A. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 6 15 4.57 542/1666 4.57 4.37 4.27 4.35 4.57 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50			Genera	 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 17 4.65 435/1406 4.65 4.34 4.32 4.48 4.65 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 2 1 1 1 8 4.14 1000/1615 4.14 4.27 4.24 4.47 4.14 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 0 2 12 6 3.91 1010/1565 3.91 4.07 4.07 4.17 3.91 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 5 9 7 3.95 969/1528 3.95 4.15 4.12 4.26 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 5 9 7 3.95 969/1528 3.95 4.15 4.12 4.26 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 5 9 7 3.95 969/1528 3.95 4.15 4.12 4.26 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 0 1 3 1 4 13 4.14 1043/1650 4.14 4.15 4.26 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 15 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 9. How would you grade the overall prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 9. How would you grade the overall prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 1.20 4.95 13.60 4.90 4.72 4.20 5.00 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.20 5.00 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.20 5.00 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.20 5.00 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.20 5.00 5.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.0	1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	388/1670	4.74	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Written instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics contribute to what you learned 1. Were prepared topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced topic relevant to the announced topic relevant	2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	542/1666	4.57	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 0 8 12 12 6 3.91 1010/1566 3.91 4.07 4.07 4.17 3.91 6. Did written assigned to contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 3 1 4 13 4.14 1043/1650 4.14 4.46 4.22 4.28 4.14 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 15 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 9 10 4.45 499/1626 4.45 4.14 4.11 4.28 4.45 Lecture Lectur	3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	435/1406	4.65	4.34	4.32	4.48	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 0 5 9 7 3,95 969/1528 3.95 4.15 4.12 4.26 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 3 1 4 13 4.14 1043/1650 4.14 4.46 4.22 4.28 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.14 1043/1650 4.14 4.16 4.22 4.28 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.19 4.19 4.19 4.19 4.19 4.19 4.19 4.19	4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	•	2	1	11	8	4.14	1000/1615	4.14	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 3 1 4 13 4.14 1043/1650 4.14 4.46 4.22 4.28 4.14 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 15 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 9 10 4.45 499/1626 4.45 4.14 4.11 4.28 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.15 4.15 4.28 4.67 4.73 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.74 4.15 4.28 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.14 4.11 4.28 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.4						1	0	2	0	2	12	6	3.91	1010/1566	3.91	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 15 7 4.32 1326/1667 4.32 4.58 4.67 4.73 4.32 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 9 10 4.45 499/1626 4.45 4.14 4.11 4.28 4.45 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.49 4.80 5.00 1.00 1.00 1 1.00 1.00 1 1.00 1.00			_		-	1	0		0	5	9	7				4.15		4.26	3.95
Second Column Second Colum			-		ined		•	_	-		4	13				4.46	4.22	4.28	4.14
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 352/1549 4.76 4.44 4.31 4.34 4.76 4.01 4.01 4.76 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01							•	•	•	0	15	7	4.32	1326/1667	4.32	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.32
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 503/1559 4.76 4.59 4.46 4.58 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 352/1549 4.76 4.44 4.31 4.43 4.76 4.50 4.00 4.10 4.76 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	499/1626	4.45	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.90 4.72 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 352/1549 4.76 4.44 4.31 4.43 4.76 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 0 4.95 116/1546 4.95 4.52 4.32 4.43 4.95 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 1 0 2 18 4.76 178/1323 4.76 4.35 4.00 4.10 4.76 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 975/1384 3.80 4.57 4.10 4.32 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 2 1 5 3.80 1092/1378 3.80 4.57 4.10 4.32 3.80 3.01 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 4.00 4.53 4.31 4.60 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 3.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.84 4.53 **** 5.00 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4.80 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4.80 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				_															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 3 17 4.76 352/1549 4.76 4.44 4.31 4.43 4.76 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 20 4.95 116/1546 4.95 4.52 4.32 4.43 4.95 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 1 0 2 18 4.76 178/1323 4.76 4.35 4.00 4.10 4.76 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 975/1384 3.80 4.27 4.10 4.32 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 2 1 5 3.80 1092/1378 3.80 4.50 4.29 4.55 3.80 3.0 did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 4.00 4.53 4.31 4.60 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.86 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Prequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough										_	3								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 20 4.95 116/1546 4.95 4.52 4.32 4.43 4.95 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 1 0 2 18 4.76 178/1323 4.76 4.35 4.00 4.10 4.76 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 975/1384 3.80 4.27 4.10 4.32 3.80 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 3.80 4.50 4.29 4.55 3.80 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 4.00 4.53 4.31 4.60 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 79 **** 4.83 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** 5.00 *** 5.00 *** 5.00 *** 5.00 **** 5.00 *** 5.00 *** 5.00 *** 5.00 ***											-								
Discussion Dis			-																
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 975/1384 3.80 4.27 4.10 4.32 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 2 1 5 3.80 1092/1378 3.80 4.50 4.29 4.55 3.80 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 4.00 4.53 4.31 4.60 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.63 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 G General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough					-		-	-	-	•	_			.,					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 975/1384 3.80 4.27 4.10 4.32 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 2 1 5 3.80 1092/1378 3.80 4.50 4.29 4.55 3.80 3.0 did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 4.00 4.53 4.31 4.60 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 8.85	5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	178/1323	4.76	4.35	4.00	4.10	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 2 1 5 3.80 1092/1378 3.80 4.50 4.29 4.55 3.80 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1 0 3 0 6 4.00 977/1378 4.00 4.53 4.31 4.60 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.45 4.53 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough																			
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors					-		-	_	-	-		_		,					
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough							-	_	_		_	-		,					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.80 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough	3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.53	4.31	4.60	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.64 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough				_															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.88 4.57 4.56 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors							-	-	-	•	U	_		, -					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.45 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors							-			-	-	_		,					
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.25 3.97 3.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 ### - Means there are not enough												-							
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 ### - Means there are not enough	_				-			-	-	-	_	-		,					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 ### - Means there are not enough	5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	•	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	3.97	3.67	****
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 ### - Means there are not enough					Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 0 General 9 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9 84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough	00-27	1	0 00-0 99		Δ 14		Rec	 miir	ad fo	 or M	 aior		1	 Graduat		0	Maic		14
84-150 15 3.00-3.49 9 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough							1000	1411	-u - () <u> </u>	۱۰۲ م	2	_	Gradat	_	•	1.10) (11
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough				-			Ger	neral	L				9	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	major	9
							Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
		-		-	P 0														•
I 0 Other 12							Oth	ner				1	.2	=					

Course-Section: GES 408 0101 Title FIELD ECOLOGY Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS

22

Enrollment:

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00

3

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 891 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	:		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	363/167	0 4.75	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.75
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	312/166		4.37	4.27		4.75
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	387/140		4.34	4.32		4.70
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75			4.27	4.24		4.75
				what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	851/156		4.07	4.07		4.00
	_	-		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53			4.15	4.12		4.53
		g system clearl		_	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84			4.46	4.22		4.84
	_	was class canc		zinca	1	0	0	0	0	8	11		1104/166		4.58	4.67		4.58
	_			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	10		387/162					4.53
1		Lectur			1	^	0	0	0	4	1 -	4 50	460/155	0 4 70	4 50	1 10	4 50	4 70
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	469/155		4.59	4.46		4.79
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	751/156		4.90	4.72		4.84
				explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	598/154		4.44	4.31		4.58
		es contribute t		_	2	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56			4.52	4.32		4.56
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	1	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	529/132	3 4.28	4.35	4.00	4.10	4.28
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	758/138	4 4.14	4.27	4.10	4.32	4.14
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	13	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1074/137	8 3.86	4.50	4.29	4.55	3.86
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	977/137	8 4.00	4.53	4.31	4.60	4.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		13	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 90	4 ****	4.00	4.03	4.22	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	nding o	of the material	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	39/ 23	2 4.78	4.43	4.19	4.35	4.78
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	44/ 23	9 4.78	4.27	4.21	4.26	4.78
_	_	_		for lab activities	11	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	132/ 23	0 4.44	4.71	4.44	4.30	4.44
	_	structor provid			11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	43/ 23	1 4.89	4.61	4.31	4.24	4.89
		-		learly specified	11	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	52/ 21	8 4.67	4.23	4.18	4.09	4.67
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	ield expe			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 4	1 5.00	4.85	4.50	4.98	5.00
				luation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	12/ 3		4.30	4.19	4.36	4.91
_		ctor available			9	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	21/ 3		4.63	4.62		4.70
		could you disc			10	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	16/ 3		4.24	4.27	4.02	4.56
				field activities	10	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	13/ 3			4.47		4.83
				E~~~	ıena.	Dia:	trib.	u+ i 0:	2									
				Frequ	rency	DIS	CLIDI	uLIO	.1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			T	ype			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	`====	0	 Gradua	 te	0	Maj	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			-			-						- 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-	grad 2	20	Non	-major	20
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D 0										-			-	
	_					_									_			_

Electives

Other

4

16

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: GES 412 0101 University of Maryland Page 892 Title BIOGEOCHEMICAL CYCLES Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions								Mean				Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.34	4.32	4.48	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	,	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75			4.58	4.67	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1559		4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25		4.25	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546		4.52	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.75	4.35	4.00	4.10	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	0		1103/1384		4.27		4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	0		970/1378	4.00	4.50	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1352/1378	2.50	4.53	4.31	4.60	2.50
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2			-			_						J -		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	4
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0													_	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0		Ot	her					2	_					
? 0														

Course-Section: GES 413 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN BIOGEOGRAPH Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008

Page 893

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies	3 4	E	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions	INIC	INA				-1		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	784/1666	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	132/1566	4.90	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	327/1650	4.70	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	900/1626	4.10	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	3		1022/1559	4.40	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40		4.40	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.52	4.32	4.43	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1323	****	4.35	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.53	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	461/ 904		4.00	4.03	4.22	4.00
•														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.88	4.64	4.60	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 75	4.75	4.88	4.57	4.56	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	55/ 79	4.25	4.63	4.45	4.53	4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	55/ 80	3.50	4.25	3.97	3.67	3.50
Frequ	ong	. Dia	+ v i b	1+ i c	^									
Frequ	епсу	DIS	CTID	uc10.	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2		_				J						5		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	0						

Course-Section: GES 435 0101 University of Maryland Title GLOB PATTERNS PROD/TRA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

BENNETT, SARI J

Instructor: Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 894

Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights, skills fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.56
_	_	ctor make clear the ex		1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1666	4.56	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.56
		uestions reflect the e		1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	546/1406	4.56	4.34	4.32	4.48	4.56
	_	uations reflect the ex		1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.56
		eadings contribute to		1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.78
	_	signments contribute t	_	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	363/1626	4.56	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.56
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.78
		ctor seem interested i		1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.80	5.00
		terial presented and e	_	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.56
		es contribute to what		1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546		4.52	4.32	4.43	4.78
		l techniques enhance y	-	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	481/1323		4.35	4.00		4.33
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
		nts actively encourage	-	3	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.55	5.00
		ctor encourage fair an		3	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1378	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.60	5.00
		echniques successful	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904		4.00	4.03		4.60
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssianed t	topics relevant to the	announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
		ctor available for ind		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.64	4.60	****
		rojects contribute to		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.88	4.57	4.56	****
	_	ons contribute to what	-	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.45	4.53	****
_		for grading made clear	-	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.25	3.97	3.67	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum CDA	Expected Grades	-					-			т	no			Majora	,
creatts E	 armea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					asons	5 			Ту	 he			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 4														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: GES 480 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV CARTOGRAPHIC APPL Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: RABENHORST, THO

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 895

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Que	estions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insigh	s,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make	clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions	reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.34	4.32	4.48	3.00
4. Did other evaluations re	eflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings co	ontribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.00
7. Was the grading system	clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class	s cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the	overall teaching effectivenes	ss 0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.67
1. Were the instructor's le	ectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem	interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material pro	esented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contril	oute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.52	4.32	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniq	ues enhance your understanding	a 0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.35	4.00	4.10	5.00
1															
1. Did class discussions co	ontribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.55	5.00
	rage fair and open discussion	n 1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.60	5.00
	Fre	equency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cu	n. GPA Expected Grade	-g			Rea	asons	3			Tν	ne			Majors	ı

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: GES 485 0101 University of Maryland Page 896 Title FIELD RESEARCH IN GEOG AUG 6, 2008

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Enrollment: 5

ELLIS, ERLE

Questionnaires: 4

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did t	rou goin n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this sourse	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2 25	1596/1670	3.25	4.49	4.31	4.45	3.25
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	2	0	0		1645/1666		4.37	4.27	4.35	2.50
		uations reflect			0	0	1	3	0	0	-		1614/1615		4.27	4.24	4.37	1.75
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0		1285/1566		4.07	4.07	4.17	3.50
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0		1274/1528		4.15	4.12	4.26	3.50
		g system clearl		_	0	0	2	1	1	0	0		1643/1650			4.22	4.28	1.75
		was class canc		inea	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		922/1667		4.58	4.67	4.73	4.75
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	0	0		1534/1626			4.11	4.28	3.00
		Lectur	0															
1 Were	the instr	actor's lecture		nrenared	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3 25	1499/1559	3.25	4.59	4.46	4.58	3.25
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	0	3		1248/1560		4.90	4.72	4.80	4.50
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	1		1389/1549			4.72	4.43	3.50
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	3	1	_		1442/1546		4.52	4.31	4.43	3.25
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	0		1040/1323			4.00	4.10	
5. DIG a	iuuiovisual	r techniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	4	2	U	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.33	4.00	4.10	3.50
! .		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0		1260/1384		4.27	4.10	4.32	3.00
		_	_	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378		4.50	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did t	the instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.60	5.00
		Labora	_															
		crease understa			3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	147/ 232		4.43	4.19	4.35	4.00
				ground information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	230/ 239		4.27	4.21	4.26	3.00
				or lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 230		4.71	4.44	4.30	5.00
		structor provid			3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	159/ 231		4.61	4.31	4.24	4.00
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	201/ 218	3.00	4.23	4.18	4.09	3.00
		Field	Work															
1. Did f	field exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did y	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	35/ 38	2.50	4.30	4.19	4.36	2.50
3. Was t	he instruc	ctor available	for con	sultation	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	33/ 38	4.00	4.63	4.62	4.58	4.00
	_	could you disc	_		2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/ 39	3.00	4.24	4.27	4.02	3.00
5. Did c	conferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 31	4.00	4.53	4.47	4.49	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00.27	0	0 00 0 00	 0	A 0								1			0			
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 0 B 1		кес	4uir	ea I	or Ma	Jors	5	1	Graduat	e	U	Majo	ΣĽ	2
	0	2.00-1.99	0	C 0		a		1				0	IIndor -	mad.	4	More	mo i o	2
56-83 84-150	0 1	3.00-2.99	1			Gei	nera.	T				U	Under-g	ıau	4	non-	-major	۷
	0		0	D 0 F 0		m 7 .	~a+ -					0		Moona +	homo -			h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	U	P 0		r16	ecti	ves				U	#### -				_	11
				P 0		Otl	2072					3	respons	es lo I	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
						OEI	ier.					3						
				? 2														

Course-Section: GES 486 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 897

	Questions					NA	Fro	_	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		Genera	_		_	_		_	_		_							
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	2			902/1670			4.31		4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	3			1199/1666		4.37		4.35	4.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	4			1057/1406		4.34		4.48	4.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4			775/1615		4.27		4.37	4.33
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3			1200/1566		4.07		4.17	3.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	,	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.00
		g system clearl		ıned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	,		4.46	4.22	4.28	4.33
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667		4.58	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	II teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well j	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the	the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did aud	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.35	4.00	4.10	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.27	4.10	4.32	3.33
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.55	4.33
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0			813/1378			4.31	4.60	4.33
				Frequ	encs	nie:	trih	utio	n									
				11040	cricy	DIS	CIID	acro.	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3 D 0											5				-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0				El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
	P 0											respons				_		
				I 0		Ot:	her					5	_		_			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 898 Course-Section: GES 491 0111 AUG 6, 2008 Title IND STUDY GEOG/ENV SYS Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA
Enrollment: 1 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

FIII OT THEILC .	±				
Questionnaires:	1	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							r r	eque	пстег	j.		Inst.	ructor		Course	рерс	UMBC	телет	sect
		Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																	
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	615	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	528	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	650	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	626	5.00	4.14	4.11	4.28	5.00
		Lectur	-																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1	559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0			0			5.00	1/1	560	5.00				
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0			1	5.00	1/1	549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	546	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.43	5.00
	Discussion																		
1. Did cla	id class discussions contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0				5.00		28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
2. Did st	udy quest	cions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/	16	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.80	4.00
3. Were ye	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	5				Туј	pe			Majors	;
		0 00 0 00										0			 e	0			
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 1 B 0		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	Jors	5	U	Grad	uate	E	U	мајс	r	0
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-1.99	0	B 0 C 0		Co	nera	1				0	TINGO	~.	rad	1	Mon	modom	1
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ge	пета	Т				U	unde	<u>-9</u> 1	Lau	Т	NOI1-	major	Т
Grad.					רים	ecti [.]	700				0	####	1	Means t	here -	re not	- anour	rh	
Grad. U 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				ъT	CCLI	veb				U			es to b			_	111		
I 0			0+	her					1	resp	OIIS	בם נט ג	c sign	ııı.caı.	16				
				5 0		UL	net					т							
				r U															

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Course-Section: GES 497 0104 University of Maryland Title RESEARCH INTERNSHIP Baltimore County Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

2

Page 899 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

					ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	85/ 239	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.26	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	188/ 230	4.00	4.71	4.44	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.61	4.31	4.24	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.30	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.63	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.02	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.53	4.47	4.49	5.00

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

Course-Section: GES 608 0101 Title FIELD ECOLOGY Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 900 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equei	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did y	you gain ne	ew insights, skills fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did t	the instruc	ctor make clear the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did t	the exam qu	uestions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did c	other evalu	uations reflect the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
		signments contribute t		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.33	4.00
		g system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1650	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How m	many times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.74	4.00
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.00
		Discussion															
1. Did c	class discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.27	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were	all studer	nts actively encourage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.42	5.00
		ctor encourage fair an		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.51	5.00
		Laboratory															
1. Did t	the lab ind	crease understanding o	f the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.30	5.00
2. Were	you provid	provided with adequate background information				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.53	5.00
3. Were	necessary	essary materials available for lab activities				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	4.71	4.44	4.69	5.00
4. Did t	the lab ins	lab instructor provide assistance				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.61	4.31	4.58	5.00
5. Were	requiremen	ne lab instructor provide assistance requirements for lab reports clearly specified				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	4.23	4.18	4.47	5.00
		Field Work															
1. Did f	field exper	rience contribute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did y	you clearly	y understand your eval	uation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.30	4.19	4.58	5.00
3. Was t	the instruc	ctor available for con	sultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.63	4.62	4.65	5.00
	_	could you discuss you		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.59	4.00
5. Did c	conferences	s help you carry out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.53	4.47	4.59	5.00
			Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27	0	 0.00-0.99 0	 A 0														
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 0 B 0		ке	4ulre	ea I	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	E	0	Majo	υT.	0
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Cor	nera:	ı				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non	major	1
84-150					GEI	тета.	_				J	onder -9	Luu	_	NOII-	ma JOI	_
Grad.					E.I.	ectiv	zes				0	#### - :	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
0100.	P 0										-	respons					
	I 0				Otl	ner					0						
	? 0																

Course-Section: GES 612 0101 Title DIOCEOCHEMICTDV Instruct

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 901

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Title	BIOGEOCHEMISTRY	Baltimore County
Instructor:	ELLIS, ERLE	Spring 2008
Enrollment:	1	

0 0

P 0

I

							Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions						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	Ο	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1406	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.36	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1615	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
	-	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.33	5.00
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.00
		Lecture	-															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.81	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.40	5.00
Discussion						0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	1 /1 2 0 4	F 00	4 05	4 10	4 01	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1384		4.27	4.10	4.21	5.00
					0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378 1/1378		4.50 4.53	4.29 4.31	4.42 4.51	5.00 5.00
		echniques succes		nd open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	U T		878/ 904		4.53			2.00
4. were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssiui		U	U	U	Т	U	U	U	2.00	8/8/ 904	2.00	4.00	4.03	4.04	2.00
				Frequ	ency.	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Туре				Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 1					or Ma	iore	. – – – !	0	Graduat		 1	 Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1/6/	darr.	Lu I	JI 140	יוטרי	,	J	Graduati	-	_	Majc	, <u>.</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	0	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	c. u	-				•	onacr 9.		~	1,011		_
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	h	
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2									_				""" Heard Chere are not chough					

Other

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: GES 613 0101 BIOGEOGRAPHY SEMINAR

Questionnaires: 1

Page 902 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

						Frequencies Ins				Ins	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.00	4.03	4.04	5.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t	copics relevant	to the	announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.88	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did re	search p	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.88	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.63	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.25	3.97	4.32	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Τv	Type			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		~		,				0	1	,	-			•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	ъ о		m 7						1	пппп -	Maana +	h			. La
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		EL	ecti	ves				1	#### - :				_	11
				P 0 T 0		O+1	hom					0	respons	responses to be significant				
				Ι υ		Other (0						

Course-Section: GES 686 0101 University of Maryland Page 903 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			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	0	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.34	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1612/1626	2.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ω	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1146/1549	4.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.35	4.00	4.03	4.00
5. Did dddiovibdai ceelmiqueb elmanee jour anaerbeanaing	O	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	0,2,1,2,2,3	1.00	1.55	1.00	1.05	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	147/ 232	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.30	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	147/ 239	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.53	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	4.71	4.44	4.69	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	159/ 231	4.00	4.61	4.31	4.58	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	143/ 218	4.00	4.23	4.18	4.47	4.00

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