```
Course-Section: GES  102  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  876
Title      HUMAN GEOGRAPHY                   Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   NEFF, ROBERT                      Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    81
Questionnaires:  40             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   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  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  3.70 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                 3  0  0  0  0 28  9  4.24 1374/1667  4.56  4.58  4.67  4.61  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 8 11 13 4.16 843/1626  4.12  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.16


              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. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.27  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 1 0 1 0 0 0 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  2.00 ****/ 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  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/ 28  ****  5.00  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   38  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 16  ****  4.00  4.67  4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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       B   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
                                       P    1                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other                 8
```

```
Course-Section: GES  102  0201              University of Maryland                              Page  877
Title        HUMAN GEOGRAPHY                    Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BENNETT, SARI J                    Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  125
Questionnaires: 62                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies         Instructor   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    1   0   0   2  10  13  36  4.36   862/1670   4.35  4.49  4.31  4.23  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   2   6  14  39  4.48   670/1666   4.43  4.37  4.27  4.30  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  34   1   3   4   6  12  3.96  1143/1615   4.06  4.27  4.24  4.17  3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 43   4   2   3   6  3.73  ****/1528   4.10  4.15  4.12  4.00  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0   0   2   8   9  39  4.47   630/1650   4.53  4.46  4.22  4.28  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5   0   0   2   0   1  54  4.88   730/1667   4.56  4.58  4.67  4.61  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1   0   0  12  26  17  4.09   905/1626   4.12  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.09


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   1   1   2  10  45  4.64   706/1559   4.71  4.59  4.46  4.47  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   3   4  53  4.83   777/1560   4.86  4.90  4.72  4.68  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   0   0   4  15  39  4.60   562/1549   4.60  4.44  4.31  4.32  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   1   5  15  38  4.53   691/1546   4.55  4.52  4.32  4.32  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  4   2   5   8  14  26  4.04   681/1323   4.22  4.35  4.00  3.91  4.04


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                   43 13   0   0   3   1   2  3.83  ****/ 904   ****  4.00  4.03  3.94  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      7     0.00-0.99    0       A    9      Required for Majors  29    Graduate     0      Major        2
28-55      5     1.00-1.99    0       B   28
56-83      6     2.00-2.99    6       C   12      General              11    Under-grad  62      Non-major   60
84-150     6     3.00-3.49    5       D    0
Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    6       F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 8
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  110  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  878
Title       PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY                   Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   LEWIS, LAURAJEA                      Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    97
Questionnaires: 38                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor    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    2   0   1   3   8   9  15  3.94 1292/1670  4.06  4.49  4.31 4.23  3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     4   0   0   4   3   8  19  4.24  991/1666  4.23  4.37  4.27 4.30  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals     5   7   0   2   4   5  15  4.27  861/1615  4.15  4.27  4.24 4.17  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  8   1   3   6   9   6  3.64 1212/1528  3.73  4.15  4.12 4.00  3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0   0   1   2   6  24  4.61  429/1650  4.62  4.46  4.22 4.28  4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0   0   0   2  22  10  4.24 1381/1667  4.21  4.58  4.67 4.61  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1   0   2   6  12   6  3.85 1181/1626  3.82  4.14  4.11 4.07  3.85


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   0   3   3   5  23  4.41 1009/1559  4.52  4.59  4.46 4.47  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   0   1   0   3  30  4.82  803/1560  4.85  4.90  4.72 4.68  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   1   2   6   8  17  4.12 1095/1549  4.19  4.44  4.31 4.32  4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0   2   1   2   7  22  4.35  899/1546  4.29  4.52  4.32 4.32  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  0   2   1   2   4  24  4.42  403/1323  4.40  4.35  4.00 3.91  4.42


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0   2   1   4   6   6  3.68 1025/1384  3.86  4.27  4.10 3.92  3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   3   2   5   4   7  3.48 1203/1378  3.82  4.50  4.29 4.09  3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0   1   1   5   2  10  4.00  977/1378  4.10  4.53  4.31 4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   17 11   2   0   2   2   4  3.60  698/ 904  3.60  4.00  4.03 3.94  3.60


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.27  4.21 4.35  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 37  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65 4.67  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  37  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  4.85  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   37 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  38  ****  4.30  4.19 4.07  ****


              Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     37  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  4.00  4.67 4.83  ****
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      6       0.00-0.99    0      A    8      Required for Majors  23    Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55      6       1.00-1.99    1      B   15                                Under-grad   38      Non-major   38
  56-83      4       2.00-2.99    3      C    3      General               1   Under-grad   38      Non-major   38
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    1      D    1
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    6      F    0      Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 3
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  110  0201            University of Maryland                             Page  879
Title      PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY                 Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MILLER, ANDREW                    Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   123
Questionnaires:  61                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   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  4.22 1015/1666  4.23  4.37  4.27  4.30  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  2 10 16 32  4.30  836/1406  4.39  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  4.10  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  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.63  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                60  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.25  3.97  3.99  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    14       0.00-0.99    0      A  22       Required for Majors  28    Graduate      0      Major        3
 28-55     5       1.00-1.99    0      B  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
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                20
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  120  0101           University of Maryland                              Page  880
Title       ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI           Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:     PARKER, EUGENE                  Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     114
Questionnaires:  71                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   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   2   0   1   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  4.60  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  4.97  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  4.07  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  4.45  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  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.27  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 69  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  4.71  4.44  4.58  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 70   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  4.85  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 70   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  4.30  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       70   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   70   0   0   0   0   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  5.00 ****/  16  ****  4.00  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      69   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  5.00  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       69   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  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  ****
```

```
                                 Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      9       0.00-0.99    0        A   21       Required for Majors  28     Graduate      1      Major        0
28-55      6       1.00-1.99    1        B   23
56-83     10       2.00-2.99    6        C   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
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other            20
                                         ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: GES  220  0101            University of Maryland                       Page 881
Title        ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE        Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  READEL, KARIN                 Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 17                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies      Instructor   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  2  5  10  4.47  708/1670   4.47  4.49  4.31  4.32  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  5  11  4.59  516/1666   4.59  4.37  4.27  4.27  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  0  0   4  5.00 ****/1406   ****  4.34  4.32  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   6  0  0  0  4   6  4.60  446/1615   4.60  4.27  4.24  4.29  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  0  1  3  1   4  3.89 1029/1566   3.89  4.07  4.07  4.00  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  5  1   4  3.90 1039/1528   3.90  4.15  4.12  4.11  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   3  0  1  2  4   7  4.21  950/1650   4.21  4.46  4.22  4.20  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  8   9  4.53 1142/1667   4.53  4.58  4.67  4.64  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  6  10  4.63  308/1626   4.63  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.63


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  1  4  10  4.60  562/1549   4.60  4.44  4.31  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  1  3  11  4.67  520/1546   4.67  4.52  4.32  4.30  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  8  0  1  1  1   4  4.14  626/1323   4.14  4.35  4.00  4.08  4.14


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  1  0   8  4.78  242/1384   4.78  4.27  4.10  4.07  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  1  0   8  4.78  379/1378   4.78  4.50  4.29  4.25  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  0  2   7  4.78  417/1378   4.78  4.53  4.31  4.26  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   3  1  0  0  1   4  4.17  417/ 904   4.17  4.00  4.03  4.01  4.17


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding 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 you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  0  0  2   8  4.80   38/ 239   4.80  4.27  4.21  4.33  4.80
3. Were necessary materials available 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 the lab instructor provide assistance            7   0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90   40/ 231   4.90  4.61  4.31  4.52  4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7   1  0  0  1  3   5  4.44   90/ 218   4.44  4.23  4.18  4.25  4.44

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  41   ****  4.85  4.50  2.00  ****
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0       A   13      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major        0
28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0       B    1
56-83      3       2.00-2.99    3       C    1      General               0     Under-grad  17      Non-major   17
84-150     5       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    4       F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                15
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  280  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  882
Title        MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI          Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SCHOOL, JOSEPH                    Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  18
Questionnaires: 12                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   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  0  1  0  1  4  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  5.00  ****/ 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

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         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        B   5                                 Under-grad  12     Non-major    6
 56-83    1        2.00-2.99   0        C   2      General               3
 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
                                        P   1                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                 8
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  310  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  883
Title        GEOMORPHOLOGY                    Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MILLER, ANDREW                     Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  38
Questionnaires: 34                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   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    1   0   0   2   7   9  15  4.12 1139/1670  4.12 4.49  4.31 4.24  4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   1   8   7  17  4.21 1015/1666  4.21 4.37  4.27 4.18  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   2   2  12  17  4.33  799/1406  4.33 4.34  4.32 4.22  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3   1   1   6  10  12  4.03 1066/1615  4.03 4.27  4.24 4.18  4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   2   6  12  12  4.06 1101/1650  4.06 4.46  4.22 4.12  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0  20  13  4.39 1263/1667  4.39 4.58  4.67 4.67  4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9  1   0   1   4  12   7  4.04  931/1626  4.04 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.04


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   1   9   2  20  4.28 1136/1559  4.28 4.59  4.46 4.40  4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   1   0  31  4.94  417/1560  4.94 4.90  4.72 4.67  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   1   7   8  16  4.22 1010/1549  4.22 4.44  4.31 4.25  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   1   0   3   1   6  21  4.45  782/1546  4.45 4.52  4.32 4.24  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0   1   1   3   9  18  4.31  498/1323  4.31 4.35  4.00 3.99  4.31


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22  0   0   0   2   2   8  4.50  603/1378  4.50 4.50  4.29 4.30  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                   22  6   0   1   2   1   2  3.67 ****/ 904  **** 4.00  4.03 4.03  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2        0.00-0.99   0      A    9        Required for Majors  5      Graduate      0        Major      13
  28-55    2        1.00-1.99   0      B    7
  56-83    5        2.00-2.99   5      C    8        General              5      Under-grad   34        Non-major  21
  84-150   3        3.00-3.49   4      D    3
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   5      F    0        Electives            3      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               17
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: GES  314  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  884
Title      GEOGRAPHY OF SOILS                   Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  HOLIFIELD, QUIN                       Spring 2008                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires:  35                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   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    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  4.41 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


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  1  3  4 10 15  4.06 1265/1559  4.06 4.59 4.46 4.40 4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  0  1  2 30  4.88  673/1560  4.88 4.90 4.72 4.67 4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  1  3  9 19  4.33  900/1549  4.33 4.44 4.31 4.25 4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3  0  2  2  2  6 20  4.25  987/1546  4.25 4.52 4.32 4.24 4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 3 1 4 10 14  3.97  743/1323  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  3.00 ****/ 232  **** 4.43 4.19 4.04 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 ****/ 239  **** 4.27 4.21 3.99 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 2 2  4.50 ****/ 230  **** 4.71 4.44 4.25 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            31 0 1 0 0 1 2  3.75 ****/ 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  4.57 ****/  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 ****

                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2       0.00-0.99    1     A   28      Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0     Major        9
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0     B    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
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                21
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  341  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 885
Title      URBAN GEOGRAPHY                    Baltimore County                                    AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  NEFF, ROBERT                       Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   37
Questionnaires:  27                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   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   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   7   9   9  3.93 1294/1666  3.93  4.37  4.27  4.18  3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   1   3   9  14  4.33  799/1406  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  861/1615  4.27  4.27  4.24  4.18  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   1   3  11   5   5  3.40 1348/1566  3.40  4.07  4.07  4.04  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 1  2   1  10   5  3.84 1088/1528  3.84  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  4.26  4.46  4.22  4.12  4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0  20   7  4.26 1368/1667  4.26  4.58  4.67  4.67  4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0   3  15   5  4.09  910/1626  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  4.26  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  556/1378  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  4.65  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  4.60  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  4.33 ****/  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  4.33 ****/  75  ****  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  4.21  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 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****
```

Title   URBAN GEOGRAPHY   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 27   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		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	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

```
                                                 Frequencies         Instructor   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   9  15  4.19 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  3.81 1383/1666  3.81  4.37  4.27  4.18  3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   8  12  10  4.00 1057/1406  4.00  4.34  4.32  4.22  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7   4   1   2  10   7  3.63 1405/1615  3.63  4.27  4.24  4.18  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   1   2   8  19  4.39  510/1566  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  3.48 1290/1528  3.48  4.15  4.12  4.07  3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   3   5   8  15  4.13 1055/1650  4.13  4.46  4.22  4.12  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0  21   9  4.30 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  3.96 1021/1626  3.96  4.14  4.11  4.06  3.96


             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
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                        Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0        A    8       Required for Majors   3      Graduate      0        Major      17
 28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0        B   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 enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                17
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  383  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  887
Title      STAT/THEMATIC CARTOGRP          Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    RABENHORST, THO             Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires:  7             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   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  6  4.86   253/1670  4.86 4.49  4.31 4.24  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  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  0  5  5.00     1/1406  5.00 4.34  4.32 4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  2  0  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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 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 0 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  0  0  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  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   288/1546  4.86 4.52  4.32 4.24  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 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  0  1  0  3  4.50   434/1384  4.50 4.27  4.10 4.12  4.50
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  4.50
4. 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  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 232  **** 4.43  4.19 4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 239  **** 4.27  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 230  **** 4.71  4.44 4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  **** 4.61  4.31 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  **** 4.23  4.18 3.93  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected 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        B   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
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                6
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  386  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  888
Title          INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM             Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    TANG, JUNMEU                          Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 17               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   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   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

                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons               Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0      A    3      Required for Majors   2     Graduate     0      Major        4
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0      B    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 enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 9
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  389  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  889
Title      GIS DATABASE DESIGN              Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   TIRSCHMAN, JEFF                Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires:  5                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor    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   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


              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  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A   3       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0     Major        5
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B   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
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                3
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  400A 0101              University of Maryland                        Page  890
Title      SEVERE STORMS                        Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  HALVERSON, JEFF                     Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 23                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor  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  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  2  6 15  4.57  542/1666  4.57 4.37  4.27 4.35  4.57
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 11  8  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  3.91 1010/1566  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  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


              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 4.43  4.76
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
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  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                                Under-grad   23     Non-major   9
 56-83     3      2.00-2.99    5      C    0      General              9
 84-150   15      3.00-3.49    9      D    0                                #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives            0            responses to be significant
                                      P    0
                                      I    0      Other               12
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  408  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  891
Title        FIELD ECOLOGY                     Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SWAN, CHRIS                        Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires:  20                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   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  5  15  4.75   363/1670   4.75  4.49  4.31  4.45  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  3  16  4.75   312/1666   4.75  4.37  4.27  4.35  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  4  15  4.70   387/1406   4.70  4.34  4.32  4.48  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  5  15  4.75   290/1615   4.75  4.27  4.24  4.37  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  1  3  6   8  4.00   851/1566   4.00  4.07  4.07  4.17  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  7  11  4.53   406/1528   4.53  4.15  4.12  4.26  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  1  17  4.84   201/1650   4.84  4.46  4.22  4.28  4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  8  11  4.58  1104/1667   4.58  4.58  4.67  4.73  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  6  10  4.53   387/1626   4.53  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.53


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  4  15  4.79   469/1559   4.79  4.59  4.46  4.58  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  3  16  4.84   751/1560   4.84  4.90  4.72  4.80  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  0  5  13  4.58   598/1549   4.58  4.44  4.31  4.43  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  1  0  5  12  4.56   655/1546   4.56  4.52  4.32  4.43  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  2  1  5  10  4.28   529/1323   4.28  4.35  4.00  4.10  4.28


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  1  1  1   4  4.14   758/1384   4.14  4.27  4.10  4.32  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  4  0   3  3.86  1074/1378   3.86  4.50  4.29  4.55  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  1  2  0   4  4.00   977/1378   4.00  4.53  4.31  4.60  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  5  1  0  0  0   1  3.00  ****/ 904   ****  4.00  4.03  4.22  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   11  0  0  0  0  2   7  4.78    39/ 232   4.78  4.43  4.19  4.35  4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  0  0  2   7  4.78    44/ 239   4.78  4.27  4.21  4.26  4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0  0  2  1   6  4.44   132/ 230   4.44  4.71  4.44  4.30  4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            11  0  0  0  0  1   8  4.89    43/ 231   4.89  4.61  4.31  4.24  4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  11  0  0  0  1  1   7  4.67    52/ 218   4.67  4.23  4.18  4.09  4.67


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   9  0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00     1/  41   5.00  4.85  4.50  4.98  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   9  0  0  0  0  1  10  4.91    12/  38   4.91  4.30  4.19  4.36  4.91
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         9  1  0  0  1  1   8  4.70    21/  38   4.70  4.63  4.62  4.58  4.70
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    10  1  0  0  1  2   6  4.56    16/  39   4.56  4.24  4.27  4.02  4.56
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  10  4  0  0  0  1   5  4.83    13/  31   4.83  4.53  4.47  4.49  4.83

                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A    9     Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B    9
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99    1       C    0     General               0      Under-grad   20      Non-major   20
 84-150    12        3.00-3.49    8       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3       F    0     Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0     Other                16
                                         ?    0
```

Title   BIOGEOCHEMICAL CYCLES   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 4   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   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  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 2 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  2  4.50   570/1650  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   922/1667  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  5.00     1/1559  5.00 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 4.25 977/1549 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  5.00 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 3.50 1103/1384 3.50 4.27 4.10 4.32 3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 970/1378 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
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  413  0101            University of Maryland                            Page  893
Title        SEMINAR IN BIOGEOGRAPH            Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  LEWIS, LAURAJEA                   Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  10              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   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  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  4.40  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   816/1549   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 4.00  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


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    8      Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0      Major        1
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    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
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 7
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  435  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 894
Title        GLOB PATTERNS PROD/TRA        Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BENNETT, SARI J               Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  12
Questionnaires: 10                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   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   1  0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  611/1670  4.56 4.49  4.31 4.45  4.56
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  556/1666  4.56 4.37  4.27 4.35  4.56
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  4  5 4.56  546/1406  4.56 4.34  4.32 4.48  4.56
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  4  5 4.56  499/1615  4.56 4.27  4.24 4.37  4.56
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  210/1566  4.78 4.07  4.07 4.17  4.78
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  1  2  5 4.50  421/1528  4.50 4.15  4.12 4.26  4.50
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  255/1650  4.78 4.46  4.22 4.28  4.78
 8. How many 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 would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor'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
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1560  5.00 4.90  4.72 4.80  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  622/1549  4.56 4.44  4.31 4.43  4.56
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  382/1546  4.78 4.52  4.32 4.43  4.78
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0  1  0  3  5 4.33  481/1323  4.33 4.35  4.00 4.10  4.33


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions 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
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1378  5.00 4.50  4.29 4.55  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1378  5.00 4.53  4.31 4.60  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  3  2  0  0  1  0  4 4.60  202/ 904  4.60 4.00  4.03 4.22  4.60


              Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.80  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.88  4.64 4.60  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  75  **** 4.88  4.57 4.56  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.63  4.45 4.53  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9  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     0      0.00-0.99    0      A   3      Required for Majors  1     Graduate     0      Major       3
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0      B   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
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                5
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  480  0101           University of Maryland                        Page  895
Title          ADV CARTOGRAPHIC APPL       Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    RABENHORST, THO                  Spring 2008                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires: 3                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   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  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 reflect 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 contribute 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
6. 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
7. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  1157/1667  4.50  4.58  4.67  4.73  4.50
8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   278/1626  4.67  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 presented 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 contribute 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 techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1323  5.00  4.35  4.00  4.10  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1378  5.00  4.50  4.29  4.55  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1378  5.00  4.53  4.31  4.60  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   3        Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major       2
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B   0                                                       
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    1      C   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
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                 3
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  485  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  896
Title       FIELD RESEARCH IN GEOG          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ELLIS, ERLE                    Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires:  4               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies     Instructor   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  1  0  0  3  0  3.25 1596/1670  3.25  4.49  4.31  4.45  3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  2  0  0  2.50 1645/1666  2.50  4.37  4.27  4.35  2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  3  0  0  0  1.75 1614/1615  1.75  4.27  4.24  4.37  1.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  1  1  0  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  2  2  0  3.50 1274/1528  3.50  4.15  4.12  4.26  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  1  1  0  0  1.75 1643/1650  1.75  4.46  4.22  4.28  1.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  922/1667  4.75  4.58  4.67  4.73  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  4  0  0  3.00 1534/1626  3.00  4.14  4.11  4.28  3.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  3  1  0  3.25 1499/1559  3.25  4.59  4.46  4.58  3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 1248/1560  4.50  4.90  4.72  4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1389/1549  3.50  4.44  4.31  4.43  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  3  1  0  3.25 1442/1546  3.25  4.52  4.32  4.43  3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  2  2  0  3.50 1040/1323  3.50  4.35  4.00  4.10  3.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1260/1384  3.00  4.27  4.10  4.32  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.50  4.29  4.55  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.53  4.31  4.60  5.00


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  147/ 232  4.00  4.43  4.19  4.35  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00  230/ 239  3.00  4.27  4.21  4.26  3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 230  5.00  4.71  4.44  4.30  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  159/ 231  4.00  4.61  4.31  4.24  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly 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 field experience contribute to what 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 you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2   0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50   35/  38  2.50  4.30  4.19  4.36  2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       2   0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00   33/  38  4.00  4.63  4.62  4.58  4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   2   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   34/  39  3.00  4.24  4.27  4.02  3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 2   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   21/  31  4.00  4.53  4.47  4.49  4.00

                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
                                                  Frequencies         Instructor   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  1  2  3  4.33   902/1670   4.33  4.49  4.31  4.45  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  3  2  4.00  1199/1666   4.00  4.37  4.27  4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4  1  4.00  1057/1406   4.00  4.34  4.32  4.48  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33   775/1615   4.33  4.27  4.24  4.37  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  3  1  3.67  1200/1566   3.67  4.07  4.07  4.17  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  1  1  3  4.00   899/1528   4.00  4.15  4.12  4.26  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  0  1  4  4.33   806/1650   4.33  4.46  4.22  4.28  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  6  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  1  0  3  2  4.00   953/1626   4.00  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  1  0  0  0  5  4.33   481/1323   4.33  4.35  4.00  4.10  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   797/1378   4.33  4.50  4.29  4.55  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   813/1378   4.33  4.53  4.31  4.60  4.33
```

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires: 1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   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   1  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   1  5.00   1/1666  5.00  4.37  4.27  4.35  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1615  5.00  4.27  4.24  4.37  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1566  5.00  4.07  4.07  4.17  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1528  5.00  4.15  4.12  4.26  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1650  5.00  4.46  4.22  4.28  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  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1626  5.00  4.14  4.11  4.28  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1559  5.00  4.59  4.46  4.58  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  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1549  5.00  4.44  4.31  4.43  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  4.43  5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1384  5.00  4.27  4.10  4.32  5.00


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  28  5.00  5.00  4.64  5.00  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  13/  16  4.00  4.00  4.67  4.80  4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/  27  5.00  5.00  4.54  5.00  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Title   RESEARCH INTERNSHIP   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   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
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0         0.00-0.99    0      A   0        Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0    Major        0
28-55     0         1.00-1.99    0      B   0
56-83     0         2.00-2.99    0      C   0        General               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
                                        P   2                                   responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                 0
                                        ?   0
```

```
Title        FIELD ECOLOGY                    Baltimore County                                     AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SWAN, CHRIS                      Spring 2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires:  1              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor   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  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  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  0  1  5.00    1/1406  5.00 4.34  4.32 4.36  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1615  5.00 4.27  4.24 4.33  5.00
5. Did assigned readings 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
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  1  0  4.00 1524/1667  4.00 4.58  4.67 4.74  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor'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 class discussions 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 students actively encouraged to participate 0   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  0  1  5.00    1/1378  5.00 4.53  4.31 4.51  5.00

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of 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 provided with adequate background information 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 239  5.00 4.27  4.21 4.53  5.00
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  0  1  5.00    1/ 231  5.00 4.61  4.31 4.58  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 218  5.00 4.23  4.18 4.47  5.00

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what 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 you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  38  5.00 4.30  4.19 4.58  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  38  5.00 4.63  4.62 4.65  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   25/  39  4.00 4.24  4.27 4.59  4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  31  5.00 4.53  4.47 4.59  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  612  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  901
Title        BIOGEOCHEMISTRY                   Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ELLIS, ERLE                         Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      1
Questionnaires:  1                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   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  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  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  0  1  5.00   1/1406   5.00  4.34  4.32  4.36   5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1615   5.00  4.27  4.24  4.33   5.00
5. Did assigned readings 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
6. Did written assignments contribute 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 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  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  0  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  0  1  5.00   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
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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  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  0  1  5.00   1/1378   5.00  4.53  4.31  4.51   5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  878/ 904  2.00  4.00  4.03  4.04   2.00


                              Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   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  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  0  4.00 1199/1666   4.00  4.37  4.27  4.34  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1083/1615   4.00  4.27  4.24  4.33  4.00
5. Did assigned readings 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
6. Did written assignments contribute 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 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  1  0  4.00 1524/1667   4.00  4.58  4.67  4.74  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1626   5.00  4.14  4.11  4.20  5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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  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  0  1  5.00    1/1378   5.00  4.53  4.31  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 904   5.00  4.00  4.03  4.04  5.00

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics 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 instructor available for individual attention 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  79   5.00  4.88  4.64  4.67  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute 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 presentations 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 criteria for grading made clear                 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  80   5.00  4.25  3.97  4.32  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  686  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  903
Title          INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM        Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    TANG, JUNMEU                    Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
Questionnaires: 1                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies         Instructor   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  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  0  0  0  0  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  4.00 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


                 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


                                    Frequency Distribution

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