

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	187
Questionnaires:	119

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	9	30	29	49	3.98	1122/1449	4.15	4.42	4.33	4.14	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	17	47	48	4.14	979/1446	4.23	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	3	24	30	55	4.06	915/1256	4.22	4.34	4.34	4.21	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	5	10	33	33	33	3.69	1198/1402	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.10	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	10	3	22	44	35	3.80	1023/1358	3.75	4.02	4.13	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	6	11	29	33	31	3.65	1066/1327	3.79	4.16	4.16	3.92	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	2	9	18	19	65	4.20	818/1435	4.27	4.34	4.20	4.11	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	0	0	64	49	4.40	1095/1446	4.62	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	3	2	25	46	20	3.81	1075/1437	3.96	4.12	4.12	4.04	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	2	5	22	82	4.59	716/1386	4.52	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	7	11	93	4.72	940/1390	4.73	4.81	4.74	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	3	11	32	65	4.37	796/1379	4.40	4.42	4.34	4.28	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	4	9	32	65	4.35	829/1379	4.46	4.37	4.36	4.26	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	4	4	20	34	47	4.06	688/1236	4.30	4.30	4.08	3.93	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/1121	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	112	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/1122	4.16	4.40	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	113	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1121	4.39	4.56	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	114	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/790	3.57	3.84	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	187
Questionnaires:	119

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	A	31	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	55						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C	13	General	65	Under-grad	119	Non-major	118
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	13	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	20						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	214
Questionnaires:	115

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	17	37	58	4.32	834/1449	4.15	4.42	4.33	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	22	29	62	4.33	776/1446	4.23	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	16	29	66	4.38	675/1256	4.22	4.34	4.34	4.21	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	5	19	38	46	4.10	957/1402	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.10	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	9	5	29	27	34	3.69	1076/1358	3.75	4.02	4.13	4.04	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	6	29	38	35	3.92	924/1327	3.79	4.16	4.16	3.92	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	5	15	24	65	4.34	687/1435	4.27	4.34	4.20	4.11	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	0	15	95	4.83	687/1446	4.62	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	2	0	14	49	30	4.11	803/1437	3.96	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	12	30	66	4.45	866/1386	4.52	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	17	88	4.75	889/1390	4.73	4.81	4.74	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	11	37	60	4.42	743/1379	4.40	4.42	4.34	4.28	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	5	26	76	4.58	600/1379	4.46	4.37	4.36	4.26	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	2	9	26	69	4.53	317/1236	4.30	4.30	4.08	3.93	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	6	9	12	28	4.02	724/1121	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.89	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	58	0	2	3	9	13	30	4.16	804/1122	4.16	4.40	4.36	4.09	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	0	3	6	14	34	4.39	704/1121	4.39	4.56	4.40	4.08	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	58	27	3	4	7	5	11	3.57	621/790	3.57	3.84	4.06	3.89	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	214
Questionnaires:	115

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	109	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	110	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	112	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	112	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	112	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	112	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	112	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	112	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200
Title:	Human Geography
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	214
Questionnaires:	115

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	112	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	39	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	2	B	52						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	12	C	9	General	71	Under-grad	115	Non-major	115
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	14						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 100
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	125
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	18	17	4.28	886/1449	3.78	4.42	4.33	4.14	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	11	24	4.48	610/1446	3.99	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	17	23	4.58	458/1256	4.01	4.34	4.34	4.21	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	3	12	16	4.42	655/1402	3.88	4.22	4.27	4.10	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	7	12	16	4.17	717/1358	3.81	4.02	4.13	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	915/1327	3.93	4.16	4.16	3.92	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	3	8	26	4.53	459/1435	4.34	4.34	4.20	4.11	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	546/1446	4.57	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	7	19	7	4.00	868/1437	3.50	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	33	4.80	371/1386	4.31	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	34	4.85	659/1390	4.31	4.81	4.74	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	12	24	4.54	599/1379	4.02	4.42	4.34	4.28	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	14	24	4.55	633/1379	3.94	4.37	4.36	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	9	27	4.56	290/1236	3.98	4.30	4.08	3.93	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	896/1121	4.20	4.20	4.18	3.89	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	3	2	3	1	4	3.08	1077/1122	3.93	4.40	4.36	4.09	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1043/1121	4.14	4.56	4.40	4.08	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	28	10	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/790	4.17	3.84	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 100
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Miller, Andrew J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	125
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	17	Under-grad	41	Non-major	39
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Cleary,Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	123
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	14	13	16	13	6	2.74	1433/1449	3.78	4.42	4.33	4.14	2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	8	12	21	12	8	3.00	1411/1446	3.99	4.32	4.29	4.20	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	11	11	14	13	12	3.07	1232/1256	4.01	4.34	4.34	4.21	3.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	28	9	5	9	6	5	2.79	1380/1402	3.88	4.22	4.27	4.10	2.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	9	9	4	13	18	5	3.12	1288/1358	3.81	4.02	4.13	4.04	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	45	4	3	3	4	0	2.50	****/1327	3.93	4.16	4.16	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	7	9	8	18	19	3.54	1254/1435	4.34	4.34	4.20	4.11	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	1	26	32	4.47	1049/1446	4.57	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	11	17	16	6	2	2.44	1423/1437	3.50	4.12	4.12	4.04	2.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	6	7	17	19	11	3.37	1337/1386	4.31	4.62	4.48	4.40	3.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	5	14	15	17	9	3.18	1382/1390	4.31	4.81	4.74	4.67	3.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	13	11	18	11	6	2.76	1356/1379	4.02	4.42	4.34	4.28	2.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	17	13	12	12	6	2.62	1365/1379	3.94	4.37	4.36	4.26	2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	12	10	11	15	7	2.91	1168/1236	3.98	4.30	4.08	3.93	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	6	1	3	2	2	2.50	****/1121	4.20	4.20	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	5	3	3	2	1	2.36	****/1122	3.93	4.40	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	4	1	6	2	1	2.64	****/1121	4.14	4.56	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	49	7	2	0	4	1	0	2.57	****/790	4.17	3.84	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Cleary, Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	123
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Cleary, Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	123
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1 A 18	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1 B 21						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5 C 14	General	31	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7 D 2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14 F 0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			1 P 1						
			0 I 0	Other	3				
			7 ? 7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 400
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	8	4.33	821/1449	3.78	4.42	4.33	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	571/1446	3.99	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	665/1256	4.01	4.34	4.34	4.21	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1402	3.88	4.22	4.27	4.10	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	727/1358	3.81	4.02	4.13	4.04	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1327	3.93	4.16	4.16	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	50/1435	4.34	4.34	4.20	4.11	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1151/1446	4.57	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	822/1437	3.50	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	425/1386	4.31	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	582/1390	4.31	4.81	4.74	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	302/1379	4.02	4.42	4.34	4.28	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	508/1379	3.94	4.37	4.36	4.26	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	362/1236	3.98	4.30	4.08	3.93	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	190/1121	4.20	4.20	4.18	3.89	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	303/1122	3.93	4.40	4.36	4.09	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	234/1121	4.14	4.56	4.40	4.08	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	379/790	4.17	3.84	4.06	3.89	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 400
Title:	Physical Geography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 1
Title:	Env Science/Conservation
Instructor:	Parker, Eugene P

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	193
Questionnaires:	91

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	6	15	65	4.58	486/1449	4.58	4.42	4.33	4.14	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	23	56	4.46	624/1446	4.46	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	5	12	20	50	4.25	791/1256	4.25	4.34	4.34	4.21	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	57	2	4	4	3	19	4.03	1002/1402	4.03	4.22	4.27	4.10	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	30	9	6	10	11	22	3.53	1159/1358	3.53	4.02	4.13	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	71	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	****/1327	****	4.16	4.16	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	5	13	67	4.61	382/1435	4.61	4.34	4.20	4.11	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	73	4.82	687/1446	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	1	2	30	45	4.44	438/1437	4.44	4.12	4.12	4.04	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	14	69	4.81	371/1386	4.81	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	83	4.93	372/1390	4.93	4.81	4.74	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	6	17	60	4.59	541/1379	4.59	4.42	4.34	4.28	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	14	68	4.74	400/1379	4.74	4.37	4.36	4.26	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	2	3	10	21	38	4.22	583/1236	4.22	4.30	4.08	3.93	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	65	0	2	0	2	8	14	4.23	618/1121	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.89	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	555/1122	4.48	4.40	4.36	4.09	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	65	0	0	1	4	4	17	4.42	673/1121	4.42	4.56	4.40	4.08	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	66	17	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 1
Title:	Env Science/Conservation
Instructor:	Parker, Eugene P

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	193
Questionnaires:	91

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	90	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	90	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	41						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	16	General	38	Under-grad	91	Non-major	89
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	14	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	705/1449	4.43	4.42	4.33	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	724/1446	4.38	4.32	4.29	4.27	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	556/1256	4.48	4.34	4.34	4.36	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	917/1402	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1060/1358	3.73	4.02	4.13	4.13	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	621/1327	4.30	4.16	4.16	4.12	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	459/1435	4.52	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	627/1446	4.86	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	724/1437	4.18	4.12	4.12	4.10	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	443/1386	4.76	4.62	4.48	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	531/1390	4.90	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	743/1379	4.43	4.42	4.34	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	666/1379	4.52	4.37	4.36	4.37	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	864/1236	3.83	4.30	4.08	4.16	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	4.20	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1122	****	4.40	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	****	4.56	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	24/200	4.81	4.58	4.28	4.35	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	36/205	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.10	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	55/201	4.76	4.62	4.51	4.42	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	16/202	4.90	4.38	4.42	4.32	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	133/196	4.19	4.24	4.25	4.10	4.19
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	3.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 220 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title: Env Sci Lab & Field Tech		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons			Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	38	4.68	348/1449	4.68	4.42	4.33	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	20	21	4.24	874/1446	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.27	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	20	22	4.20	819/1256	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	5	14	22	4.30	762/1402	4.30	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	33	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	905/1358	3.93	4.02	4.13	4.13	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	0	1	7	7	12	4.11	783/1327	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.12	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	7	11	24	4.06	938/1435	4.06	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	6	17	17	4.28	616/1437	4.28	4.12	4.12	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	12	34	4.63	660/1386	4.63	4.62	4.48	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	41	4.81	761/1390	4.81	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	2	15	28	4.42	756/1379	4.42	4.42	4.34	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	4	13	26	4.30	866/1379	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.37	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	10	32	4.66	228/1236	4.66	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	3	5	7	8	3.75	854/1121	3.75	4.20	4.18	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	2	4	9	8	3.88	930/1122	3.88	4.40	4.36	4.34	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	761/1121	4.27	4.56	4.40	4.39	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	27	12	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	3	7	26	4.64	55/200	4.64	4.58	4.28	4.35	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	7	5	22	4.37	119/205	4.37	4.40	4.29	4.10	4.37
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	1	2	30	4.79	44/201	4.79	4.62	4.51	4.42	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	54/202	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.32	4.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	1	6	10	16	4.24	125/196	4.24	4.24	4.25	4.10	4.24
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	4	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	4	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	4	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	23/34	4.31	4.77	4.33	3.66	4.31
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	21/35	4.07	4.27	4.15	3.19	4.07
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	17/30	4.31	4.31	4.09	3.74	4.31
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	4	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	6	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	1	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	10	Under-grad	50	Non-major	42
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 1
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Luna,Ronald W

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	11	19	4.48	621/1449	4.61	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	21	4.55	518/1446	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	367/1256	4.70	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	19	4.45	599/1402	4.57	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	3	9	13	3.93	905/1358	4.16	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	11	15	4.29	629/1327	4.22	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	9	19	4.30	720/1435	4.58	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	211/1446	4.95	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	6	14	6	4.00	868/1437	4.17	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	716/1386	4.76	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	980/1390	4.90	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	7	19	4.41	770/1379	4.60	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	445/1379	4.76	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	10	16	4.37	468/1236	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	593/1121	4.49	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	665/1122	4.61	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	498/1121	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	359/790	4.20	3.84	4.06	4.11	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 1
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Luna,Ronald W

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 2
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Huemmrich,Karl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	567/1449	4.61	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	885/1446	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	458/1256	4.70	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	468/1402	4.57	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	986/1358	4.16	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	637/1327	4.22	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	370/1435	4.58	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	526/1446	4.95	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	10	4	3.89	1022/1437	4.17	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	371/1386	4.76	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1390	4.90	4.81	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	576/1379	4.60	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	461/1379	4.76	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	290/1236	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	283/1121	4.49	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	243/1122	4.61	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1121	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/790	4.20	3.84	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 2
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Huemmrich,Karl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 302 2	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 39
Title: Selected Topics In Geog		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Huemmrich,Karl		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Graduate	Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	Under-grad	Non-major 15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		
			Electives 5		
			Other 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 3
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Caro

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	201/1449	4.61	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	140/1446	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	174/1256	4.70	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	281/1402	4.57	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	191/1358	4.16	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	6	13	4.07	808/1327	4.22	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	147/1435	4.58	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1446	4.95	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	279/1437	4.17	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	237/1386	4.76	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1390	4.90	4.81	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	187/1379	4.60	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	239/1379	4.76	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	1	23	4.70	192/1236	4.54	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	371/1121	4.49	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	429/1122	4.61	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	316/1121	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/790	4.20	3.84	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 3
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Caro

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 310 1
Title:	Geomorphology
Instructor:	Miller,Andrew J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	540/1449	4.55	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	453/1446	4.59	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	345/1256	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	444/1402	4.58	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	4	13	4.19	688/1358	4.19	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	562/1327	4.37	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	687/1435	4.33	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	627/1446	4.86	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	702/1437	4.19	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	840/1386	4.48	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.81	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	451/1379	4.65	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	461/1379	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	297/1236	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1121	****	4.20	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1122	****	4.40	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1121	****	4.56	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 310 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 41
Title: Geomorphology		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Miller, Andrew J		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 313 1
Title:	Biogeography
Instructor:	Lewis,Laurajean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	947/1449	4.20	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	440/1446	4.60	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	302/1256	4.72	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	362/1402	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	12	4.00	827/1358	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	4	14	4.20	704/1327	4.20	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	247/1435	4.72	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	928/1446	4.63	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	747/1437	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	707/1386	4.61	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	761/1390	4.82	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	529/1379	4.59	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	926/1379	4.23	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	331/1236	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1121	****	4.20	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1122	****	4.40	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1121	****	4.56	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 313 1
Title:	Biogeography
Instructor:	Lewis,Laurajean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 313 1
Title:	Biogeography
Instructor:	Lewis,Laurajean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 18	Required for Majors	16 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6 C 0	General	1 Under-grad 26 Non-major 25
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 330 1
Title:	Geog Of Econ Development
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	513/1449	4.57	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	368/1446	4.65	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	433/1256	4.61	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	599/1402	4.45	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	177/1358	4.74	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	4.22	695/1327	4.22	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	720/1435	4.30	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	949/1446	4.61	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	573/1437	4.32	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	337/1386	4.83	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	478/1390	4.91	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	343/1379	4.74	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	415/1379	4.74	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	331/1236	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	353/1121	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	294/1122	4.79	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	427/1121	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	2	1	0	5	3.67	590/790	3.67	3.84	4.06	4.11	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 330 1
Title:	Geog Of Econ Development
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 330 1
Title:	Geog Of Econ Development
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 363 1
Title:	World Regions: Cont Iss
Instructor:	Steele,Christop

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	771/1449	4.38	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.47	624/1446	4.47	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	14	4.22	812/1256	4.22	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	420/1402	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	293/1358	4.59	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	488/1327	4.44	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	10	18	4.38	644/1435	4.38	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	788/1446	4.75	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	627/1437	4.26	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	553/1386	4.71	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	531/1390	4.90	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	702/1379	4.45	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	496/1379	4.68	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	256/1236	4.61	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	7	13	4.29	581/1121	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	370/1122	4.71	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	339/1121	4.79	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	2	0	5	8	5	3.70	579/790	3.70	3.84	4.06	4.11	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 363 1
Title:	World Regions: Cont Iss
Instructor:	Steele,Christop

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	32

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	22
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 383 1
Title:	Stat/Thematic Cartography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	192/1449	4.83	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	505/1446	4.56	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	665/1256	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	362/1402	4.65	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1358	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	309/1327	4.60	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	370/1435	4.61	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	938/1446	4.61	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	550/1437	4.33	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	320/1386	4.83	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	582/1390	4.89	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	504/1379	4.61	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	430/1379	4.72	4.37	4.36	4.40	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	97/1236	4.87	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	547/1121	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	212/1122	4.87	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1121	4.87	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	259/790	4.40	3.84	4.06	4.11	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 383 1
Title:	Stat/Thematic Cartography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	49/200	4.67	4.58	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	85/205	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	82/201	4.69	4.62	4.51	4.59	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	149/202	4.31	4.38	4.42	4.48	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	170/196	3.73	4.24	4.25	4.37	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 383 1
Title:	Stat/Thematic Cartography
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 1
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems
Instructor:	School,Joseph

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	11	13	4.21	907/1446	4.21	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	4	18	4.36	696/1256	4.36	4.34	4.34	4.39	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	3	17	4.40	670/1402	4.40	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	4	5	4	6	3.17	1278/1358	3.17	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	654/1327	4.27	4.16	4.16	4.23	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	16	4.14	878/1435	4.14	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1446	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	835/1437	4.05	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	828/1386	4.48	4.62	4.48	4.53	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	5	20	4.59	1079/1390	4.59	4.81	4.74	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	7	12	4.04	1046/1379	4.04	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	4	13	3.81	1159/1379	3.81	4.37	4.36	4.40	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	576/1236	4.23	4.30	4.08	4.18	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	915/1121	3.56	4.20	4.18	4.31	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	857/1122	4.00	4.40	4.36	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	234/1121	4.89	4.56	4.40	4.53	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	18	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 1
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems
Instructor:	School,Joseph

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	68/200	4.53	4.58	4.28	4.44	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	78/205	4.53	4.40	4.29	4.44	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	65/201	4.73	4.62	4.51	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	2	1	0	12	4.47	116/202	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.48	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	20/196	4.75	4.24	4.25	4.37	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 1
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems
Instructor:	School,Joseph

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 1
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Cleary,Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	9	4.15	997/1449	4.45	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	962/1446	4.35	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	696/1256	4.51	4.34	4.34	4.43	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	762/1402	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	10	4.00	827/1358	4.17	4.02	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	611/1327	4.36	4.16	4.16	4.28	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	612/1435	4.23	4.34	4.20	4.27	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	526/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1042/1437	4.35	4.12	4.12	4.20	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	803/1386	4.67	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	710/1390	4.89	4.81	4.74	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1010/1379	4.46	4.42	4.34	4.40	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1053/1379	4.43	4.37	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	538/1236	4.43	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	868/1121	4.21	4.20	4.18	4.39	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	360/1122	4.60	4.40	4.36	4.54	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	269/1121	4.76	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	287/790	4.30	3.84	4.06	4.27	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 1
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Cleary,Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11 Required for Majors	13 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General	2	Under-grad 20 Non-major
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 2
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Halverson,Jeffr

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	238/1449	4.45	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	368/1446	4.35	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	291/1256	4.51	4.34	4.34	4.43	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	504/1402	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	827/1358	4.17	4.02	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	591/1327	4.36	4.16	4.16	4.28	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	8	8	3.95	1015/1435	4.23	4.34	4.20	4.27	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	263/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	270/1437	4.35	4.12	4.12	4.20	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	270/1386	4.67	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1390	4.89	4.81	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	248/1379	4.46	4.42	4.34	4.40	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	295/1379	4.43	4.37	4.36	4.44	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	97/1236	4.43	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	547/1121	4.21	4.20	4.18	4.39	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	537/1122	4.60	4.40	4.36	4.54	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	383/1121	4.76	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/790	4.30	3.84	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 400 2	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 27
Title: Selected Topics In Geog		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Halverson, Jeffr		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55 1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8			
56-83 1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 23	Non-major 14
84-150 11	3.00-3.49 6	D 0			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 1		
		? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 3
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	705/1449	4.45	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	885/1446	4.35	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	619/1256	4.51	4.34	4.34	4.43	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	570/1402	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	353/1358	4.17	4.02	4.13	4.21	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	500/1327	4.36	4.16	4.16	4.28	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	9	10	4.33	687/1435	4.23	4.34	4.20	4.27	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	526/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	304/1437	4.35	4.12	4.12	4.20	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	630/1386	4.67	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	659/1390	4.89	4.81	4.74	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	675/1379	4.46	4.42	4.34	4.40	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	717/1379	4.43	4.37	4.36	4.44	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	633/1236	4.43	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	347/1121	4.21	4.20	4.18	4.39	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	471/1122	4.60	4.40	4.36	4.54	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	473/1121	4.76	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	317/790	4.30	3.84	4.06	4.27	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 3
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	3.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 3
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog
Instructor:	Lansing,David

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 415 1
Title:	Climate Change
Instructor:	Mehta,Amita V

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	5	5	10	3.83	1222/1449	3.83	4.42	4.33	4.46	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	7	8	3.88	1168/1446	3.88	4.32	4.29	4.34	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	6	9	3.91	1008/1256	3.91	4.34	4.34	4.43	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	6	8	8	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	9	3	6	3.41	1204/1358	3.41	4.02	4.13	4.21	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	8	4	8	3.70	1047/1327	3.70	4.16	4.16	4.28	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	7	12	4.13	898/1435	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.27	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	15	6	4.17	1268/1446	4.17	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	6	6	7	1	3.15	1352/1437	3.15	4.12	4.12	4.20	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	866/1386	4.46	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	710/1390	4.83	4.81	4.74	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	9	6	3.79	1175/1379	3.79	4.42	4.34	4.40	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	5	8	3.61	1231/1379	3.61	4.37	4.36	4.44	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	6	9	4	3.48	1024/1236	3.48	4.30	4.08	4.13	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1039/1121	3.14	4.20	4.18	4.39	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	998/1122	3.57	4.40	4.36	4.54	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	544/1121	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 415 1
Title:	Climate Change
Instructor:	Mehta,Amita V

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 462 1
Title:	Human-Environment Gis
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	209/1449	4.82	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	841/1446	4.27	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1256	4.33	4.34	4.34	4.43	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1185/1402	3.73	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	939/1358	3.91	4.02	4.13	4.21	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1089/1327	3.60	4.16	4.16	4.28	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	970/1435	4.00	4.34	4.20	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	949/1446	4.60	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	803/1437	4.10	4.12	4.12	4.20	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1090/1386	4.20	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	787/1390	4.80	4.81	4.74	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	946/1379	4.20	4.42	4.34	4.40	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.37	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	709/1236	4.00	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	587/1121	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.39	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	612/1122	4.43	4.40	4.36	4.54	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	427/1121	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 462 1
Title:	Human-Environment Gis
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	39/200	4.71	4.58	4.28	4.11	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	107/205	4.43	4.40	4.29	3.91	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	168/201	4.20	4.62	4.51	4.19	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	187/202	3.71	4.38	4.42	3.90	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	144/196	4.00	4.24	4.25	3.43	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	16/31	4.57	4.25	4.34	4.17	4.57
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	10/18	4.33	4.29	4.13	4.00	4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	15/24	4.43	4.31	4.34	3.98	4.43
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 483 1
Title:	Gis Internship
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	1
Questionnaires:	1

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.42	4.33	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1061/1446	4.00	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1437	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.20	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/34	5.00	4.77	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/35	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.16	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.96	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/27	5.00	5.00	4.13	4.20	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	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 485 1
Title:	Field Research In Geog
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	947/1449	4.20	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	808/1446	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.34	4.43	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1194/1402	3.70	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	776/1358	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.21	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	404/1327	4.50	4.16	4.16	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1187/1435	3.70	4.34	4.20	4.27	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1103/1437	3.78	4.12	4.12	4.20	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1145/1386	4.10	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	531/1390	4.90	4.81	4.74	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	635/1379	4.50	4.42	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1254/1379	3.50	4.37	4.36	4.44	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	823/1236	3.90	4.30	4.08	4.13	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	396/1121	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	322/1122	4.75	4.40	4.36	4.54	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1121	4.50	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 485 1
Title:	Field Research In Geog
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/200	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	127/205	4.33	4.40	4.29	3.91	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	151/201	4.33	4.62	4.51	4.19	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	194/202	3.33	4.38	4.42	3.90	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	188/196	3.00	4.24	4.25	3.43	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/34	5.00	4.77	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	26/35	3.75	4.27	4.15	4.16	3.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/27	5.00	5.00	4.13	4.20	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 485 1
Title:	Field Research In Geog
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 486 1
Title:	Adv Appl Geog Info Sys
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	860/1449	4.30	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1061/1446	4.00	4.32	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1163/1256	3.50	4.34	4.34	4.43	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1094/1402	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	628/1358	4.25	4.02	4.13	4.21	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	944/1327	3.89	4.16	4.16	4.28	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	818/1435	4.20	4.34	4.20	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	566/1446	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1145/1437	3.71	4.12	4.12	4.20	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	204/1386	4.90	4.62	4.48	4.55	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	787/1390	4.80	4.81	4.74	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	1018/1379	4.10	4.42	4.34	4.40	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1163/1379	3.80	4.37	4.36	4.44	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	394/1236	4.44	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	882/1121	3.67	4.20	4.18	4.39	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	798/1122	4.17	4.40	4.36	4.54	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	855/1121	4.00	4.56	4.40	4.60	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 486 1
Title:	Adv Appl Geog Info Sys
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	153/200	4.00	4.58	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	178/205	3.67	4.40	4.29	3.91	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/201	5.00	4.62	4.51	4.19	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	145/202	4.33	4.38	4.42	3.90	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	111/196	4.33	4.24	4.25	3.43	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 600 1
Title:	Special Topics in GES
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1449	4.83	4.42	4.33	4.41	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	953/1446	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1274/1402	3.50	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	232/1358	4.67	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	992/1327	3.80	4.16	4.16	4.29	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1118/1435	3.83	4.34	4.20	4.23	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	949/1446	4.60	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	868/1437	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.62	4.48	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.81	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1379	4.75	4.42	4.34	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	688/1379	4.50	4.37	4.36	4.35	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	709/1236	4.00	4.30	4.08	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	335/1121	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.29	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.40	4.36	4.44	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	524/1121	4.60	4.56	4.40	4.52	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	788/790	2.00	3.84	4.06	4.08	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 600 1
Title:	Special Topics in GES
Instructor:	Neff,Robert

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/67	4.75	4.75	4.58	4.67	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	50/66	4.17	4.17	4.36	4.36	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	39/64	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.32	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	55/75	4.00	4.00	4.32	4.37	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	54/73	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	24/31	3.67	4.25	4.34	4.38	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	11/18	4.25	4.29	4.13	4.22	4.25
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	16/24	4.20	4.31	4.34	4.63	4.20
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	8/15	4.50	4.50	4.18	4.75	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 602 1
Title:	Research Methods/Ges
Instructor:	Lewis,Laurajean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	677/1449	4.44	4.42	4.33	4.41	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	339/1402	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	658/1358	4.22	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	687/1327	4.22	4.16	4.16	4.29	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	898/1435	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	984/1446	4.56	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	321/1437	4.56	4.12	4.12	4.17	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	287/1386	4.86	4.62	4.48	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	659/1390	4.86	4.81	4.74	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	743/1379	4.43	4.42	4.34	4.34	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	239/1379	4.86	4.37	4.36	4.35	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	****	4.30	4.08	3.94	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	149/1121	4.83	4.20	4.18	4.29	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	691/1122	4.33	4.40	4.36	4.44	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.56	4.40	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/790	****	3.84	4.06	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 602 1
Title:	Research Methods/Ges
Instructor:	Lewis,Laurajean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 673 1
Title:	Geoprocessing & Spat Ana
Instructor:	Young,Paul M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	929/1449	4.22	4.42	4.33	4.41	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	997/1446	4.11	4.32	4.29	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	936/1256	4.00	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	468/1402	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1033/1358	3.78	4.02	4.13	4.18	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	687/1327	4.22	4.16	4.16	4.29	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1435	4.89	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	566/1446	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1437	4.50	4.12	4.12	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	237/1386	4.89	4.62	4.48	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	582/1390	4.89	4.81	4.74	4.77	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	288/1379	4.78	4.42	4.34	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	836/1379	4.33	4.37	4.36	4.35	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1236	4.33	4.30	4.08	3.94	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	674/1121	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.29	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	612/1122	4.43	4.40	4.36	4.44	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	673/1121	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.52	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	389/790	4.14	3.84	4.06	4.08	4.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 673 1
Title:	Geoprocessing & Spat Ana
Instructor:	Young,Paul M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	116/200	4.22	4.58	4.28	3.91	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	143/205	4.22	4.40	4.29	3.54	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	133/201	4.44	4.62	4.51	4.10	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	78/202	4.63	4.38	4.42	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	7/196	4.89	4.24	4.25	4.16	4.89

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 675 1
Title:	GIS Application Developm
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	334/1449	4.69	4.42	4.33	4.41	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	675/1256	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1127/1402	3.85	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	994/1358	3.83	4.02	4.13	4.18	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	924/1327	3.92	4.16	4.16	4.29	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	532/1435	4.46	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	421/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1138/1437	3.73	4.12	4.12	4.17	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	614/1386	4.67	4.62	4.48	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	684/1390	4.85	4.81	4.74	4.77	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	919/1379	4.23	4.42	4.34	4.34	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	567/1379	4.62	4.37	4.36	4.35	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	876/1236	3.82	4.30	4.08	3.94	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	795/1121	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.29	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	940/1122	3.83	4.40	4.36	4.44	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	913/1121	3.92	4.56	4.40	4.52	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	643/790	3.50	3.84	4.06	4.08	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 675 1
Title:	GIS Application Developm
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/200	****	4.58	4.28	3.91	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/205	****	4.40	4.29	3.54	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/201	****	4.62	4.51	4.10	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/202	****	4.38	4.42	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/196	****	4.24	4.25	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.25	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 675 1
Title:	GIS Application Developm
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 771 1
Title:	Advanced Spatial DBM
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	269/1449	4.75	4.42	4.33	4.41	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	176/1446	4.81	4.32	4.29	4.30	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	389/1256	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	456/1402	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	449/1358	4.44	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	299/1327	4.62	4.16	4.16	4.29	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	107/1435	4.88	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	707/1446	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	97/1437	4.86	4.12	4.12	4.17	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	143/1386	4.94	4.62	4.48	4.47	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	372/1390	4.93	4.81	4.74	4.77	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	235/1379	4.81	4.42	4.34	4.34	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	211/1379	4.88	4.37	4.36	4.35	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	61/1236	4.93	4.30	4.08	3.94	4.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	396/1121	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.29	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	264/1122	4.81	4.40	4.36	4.44	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	383/1121	4.75	4.56	4.40	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	409/790	4.10	3.84	4.06	4.08	4.10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 771 1
Title:	Advanced Spatial DBM
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	49/200	4.67	4.58	4.28	3.91	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	14/205	4.83	4.40	4.29	3.54	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	88/201	4.67	4.62	4.51	4.10	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.38	4.42	4.30	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/196	5.00	4.24	4.25	4.16	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.75	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.17	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/64	****	4.17	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/75	****	4.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	3.67	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	4.77	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	4.27	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.31	4.09	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	18/31	4.50	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/18	****	4.29	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/24	****	4.31	4.34	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 771 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Advanced Spatial DBM		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Evans,Owen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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