Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 102 100		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 187
Title: Human Geography				Questionnaires: 82
Instructor: Neff,Robert				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	8	24	45	4.41	780/1542	4.26	4.55	4.33	4.18	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	7	29	40	4.36	810/1542	4.24	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	9	22	44	4.37	721/1339	4.46	4.44	4.32	4.14	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	4	3	0	13	19	37	4.21	906/1498	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	4	4	16	15	35	3.99	877/1428	4.01	3.99	4.12	3.98	3.99
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	14	29	29	4.00	874/1407	4.02	4.04	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	4	25	46	4.48	546/1521	4.34	4.39	4.20	4.09	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	71	4.90	705/1541	4.88	4.75	4.70	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	1	0	9	34	18	4.10	849/1518	4.11	4.18	4.11	4.00	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	12	65	4.84	303/1472	4.66	4.65	4.46	4.38	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	10	65	4.84	700/1475	4.80	4.83	4.72	4.63	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	3	18	51	4.53	607/1471	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	3	15	54	4.57	619/1470	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	4	0	4	12	51	4.49	334/1310	4.53	4.38	4.06	3.93	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	4	11	18	4.23	654/1210	4.07	4.02	4.18	3.91	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	0	2	5	6	21	4.35	723/1211	4.33	4.28	4.37	4.15	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	0	3	1	7	24	4.49	648/1207	4.57	4.37	4.41	4.12	4.49
4. Were special techniques successful	48	10	1	3	3	4	13	4.04	468/859	4.04	3.87	4.08	3.95	4.04

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 187			
Title:	Human Geography											Questionnaires: 82			
Instructor:	Neff,Robert														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	79	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 100		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	187
Title:	Human Geography					Questionnaires:	82
Instructor:	Neff,Robert						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	37						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	12	General	48	Under-grad	82	Non-major	81
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 197
Title:	Human Geography					Questionnaires: 86
Instructor:	Lansing,David					

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	5	10	37	32	4.11	1104/1542	4.26	4.55	4.33	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	14	28	37	4.12	1069/1542	4.24	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	28	53	4.55	529/1339	4.46	4.44	4.32	4.14	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	5	11	25	40	4.20	916/1498	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	5	12	26	36	4.02	839/1428	4.01	3.99	4.12	3.98	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	8	16	16	41	4.04	860/1407	4.02	4.04	4.15	3.92	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	3	12	25	40	4.20	902/1521	4.34	4.39	4.20	4.09	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	11	72	4.87	754/1541	4.88	4.75	4.70	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	2	10	28	21	4.11	832/1518	4.11	4.18	4.11	4.00	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	4	29	46	4.47	871/1472	4.66	4.65	4.46	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	16	63	4.75	897/1475	4.80	4.83	4.72	4.63	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	6	23	48	4.45	711/1471	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	7	14	56	4.56	640/1470	4.57	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	1	0	4	19	47	4.56	277/1310	4.53	4.38	4.06	3.93	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	5	7	4	17	3.91	846/1210	4.07	4.02	4.18	3.91	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	2	2	3	4	24	4.31	755/1211	4.33	4.28	4.37	4.15	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	518/1207	4.57	4.37	4.41	4.12	4.65

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 102 200		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment:	197
Title:	Human Geography											Questionnaires:	86
Instructor:	Lansing,David												

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	52	19	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	****/859	4.04	3.87	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	32	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	48	Under-grad	86	Non-major	86
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	15						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 110 100	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 137
Title: Physical Geography		Questionnaires: 70
Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	20	40	4.41	765/1542	4.29	4.55	4.33	4.18	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	12	47	4.49	628/1542	4.45	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	11	47	4.43	671/1339	4.53	4.44	4.32	4.14	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	9	14	31	4.36	733/1498	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	4	5	8	16	23	3.88	1007/1428	3.76	3.99	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	40	2	4	3	7	11	3.78	1069/1407	3.69	4.04	4.15	3.92	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	11	52	4.62	382/1521	4.55	4.39	4.20	4.09	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	66	4.97	207/1541	4.92	4.75	4.70	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	12	28	19	4.03	896/1518	3.95	4.18	4.11	4.00	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	12	55	4.79	384/1472	4.75	4.65	4.46	4.38	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	61	4.88	592/1475	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.63	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	7	15	46	4.57	567/1471	4.58	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	9	14	46	4.54	660/1470	4.48	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	8	13	44	4.52	316/1310	4.50	4.38	4.06	3.93	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	3	1	6	3	8	3.57	994/1210	3.81	4.02	4.18	3.91	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	739/1211	4.44	4.28	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1003/1207	4.16	4.37	4.41	4.12	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	49	14	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 110 100		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 137
Title: Physical Geography				Questionnaires: 70
Instructor: Rabenhorst,Thom				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	66	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	68	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	67	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 100	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	137
Title:	Physical Geography			Questionnaires:	70
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	32						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	11	C	9	General	39	Under-grad	70	Non-major	69
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 108
Title:	Physical Geography			Questionnaires: 49
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	10	13	23	4.17	1051/1542	4.29	4.55	4.33	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	15	27	4.42	740/1542	4.45	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	33	4.63	455/1339	4.53	4.44	4.32	4.14	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	9	12	17	4.15	956/1498	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	6	3	7	13	15	3.64	1173/1428	3.76	3.99	4.12	3.98	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	33	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1153/1407	3.69	4.04	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	4	11	30	4.47	574/1521	4.55	4.39	4.20	4.09	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	1	45	4.88	738/1541	4.92	4.75	4.70	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	8	24	5	3.87	1085/1518	3.95	4.18	4.11	4.00	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	37	4.70	538/1472	4.75	4.65	4.46	4.38	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	44	4.87	619/1475	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.63	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	11	32	4.60	547/1471	4.58	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	10	30	4.43	788/1470	4.48	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	5	11	30	4.49	344/1310	4.50	4.38	4.06	3.93	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	760/1210	3.81	4.02	4.18	3.91	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	550/1211	4.44	4.28	4.37	4.15	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	676/1207	4.16	4.37	4.41	4.12	4.46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 110 200		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment:	108	
Title:	Physical Geography							Questionnaires:	49	
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom									

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	26	16	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	18	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 120 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 180
Title: Env Science/Conservation		Questionnaires: 110
Instructor: Parker,Eugene P		

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	4	0	0	2	10	29	65	4.48	661/1542	4.21	4.55	4.33	4.18	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	15	24	66	4.46	670/1542	4.31	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	6	15	26	59	4.30	785/1339	4.20	4.44	4.32	4.14	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	70	1	5	8	4	18	3.92	1149/1498	3.94	4.25	4.26	4.08	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	13	23	10	26	11	21	2.97	1370/1428	3.32	3.99	4.12	3.98	2.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	90	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	****/1407	3.65	4.04	4.15	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	17	25	61	4.38	683/1521	4.36	4.39	4.20	4.09	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	1	5	97	4.93	482/1541	4.86	4.75	4.70	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	4	8	29	53	4.39	507/1518	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.00	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	16	85	4.79	401/1472	4.68	4.65	4.46	4.38	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	102	4.96	215/1475	4.84	4.83	4.72	4.63	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	9	21	72	4.57	577/1471	4.51	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	5	13	86	4.75	374/1470	4.62	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	5	5	18	36	37	3.94	822/1310	4.17	4.38	4.06	3.93	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	6	3	8	10	32	4.00	774/1210	3.58	4.02	4.18	3.91	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	2	5	5	19	28	4.12	880/1211	3.64	4.28	4.37	4.15	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	0	3	4	8	44	4.58	578/1207	4.02	4.37	4.41	4.12	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	51	48	1	3	1	1	5	3.55	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	180
Title:	Env Science/Conservation										Questionnaires:	110
Instructor:	Parker,Eugene P											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	105	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	105	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	105	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	106	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	106	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	106	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	106	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	106	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	106	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	106	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	106	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 120 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 180
Title:	Env Science/Conservation			Questionnaires: 110
Instructor:	Parker,Eugene P			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	106	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	19	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	54						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	12	C	21	General	51	Under-grad	110	Non-major	110
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	14	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	13	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	14						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 120 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 76
Title: Env Science/Conservation		**Questionnaires: 33**
Instructor: Holland,Margare		

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	3	15	10	3.94	1237/1542	4.21	4.55	4.33	4.18	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	13	13	4.16	1035/1542	4.31	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	8	9	14	4.09	946/1339	4.20	4.44	4.32	4.14	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	3	5	7	10	3.96	1098/1498	3.94	4.25	4.26	4.08	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	6	8	9	3.68	1151/1428	3.32	3.99	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1135/1407	3.65	4.04	4.15	3.92	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	9	17	4.34	734/1521	4.36	4.39	4.20	4.09	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	874/1541	4.86	4.75	4.70	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	8	15	3	3.74	1166/1518	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.00	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	5	22	4.58	715/1472	4.68	4.65	4.46	4.38	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	25	4.71	987/1475	4.84	4.83	4.72	4.63	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	7	20	4.45	711/1471	4.51	4.42	4.32	4.23	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	716/1470	4.62	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	3	6	19	4.40	425/1310	4.17	4.38	4.06	3.93	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	6	1	3	3.15	1112/1210	3.58	4.02	4.18	3.91	3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1161/1211	3.64	4.28	4.37	4.15	3.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1109/1207	4.02	4.37	4.41	4.12	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 120 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 76
Title: Env Science/Conservation		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Holland,Margare		

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	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	14	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 220 1		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Env Sci Lab & Field Tech										Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor:	Braunschweig,Su													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	214/1542	4.85	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	166/1339	4.89	4.44	4.32	4.40	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	357/1498	4.67	4.25	4.26	4.31	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	372/1428	4.53	3.99	4.12	4.17	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	163/1407	4.78	4.04	4.15	4.14	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	150/1521	4.84	4.39	4.20	4.22	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	874/1541	4.79	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	310/1518	4.59	4.18	4.11	4.12	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	367/1472	4.80	4.65	4.46	4.53	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	269/1475	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	413/1471	4.70	4.42	4.32	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	374/1470	4.75	4.57	4.33	4.40	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	308/1310	4.53	4.38	4.06	4.19	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	****	4.02	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	****	4.28	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	****	4.37	4.41	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 220 1	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Env Sci Lab & Field Tech		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Braunschweig,Su		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	16/207	4.89	4.37	4.12	4.26	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	19/210	4.84	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.84
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	14/202	4.95	4.78	4.50	4.62	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	20/202	4.95	4.19	4.32	4.20	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	11/199	4.89	4.52	4.15	4.32	4.89
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 57	
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View				Questionnaires: 39	
Instructor:	School,Joseph					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	28	4.69	397/1542	4.69	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	25	4.46	670/1542	4.46	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	12	19	4.26	825/1339	4.26	4.44	4.32	4.40	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	8	10	17	4.19	916/1498	4.19	4.25	4.26	4.31	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	4	6	3	3	3.18	1332/1428	3.18	3.99	4.12	4.17	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	2	0	5	7	6	3.75	1080/1407	3.75	4.04	4.15	4.14	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	5	7	20	3.95	1101/1521	3.95	4.39	4.20	4.22	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	207/1541	4.97	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	19	13	4.36	548/1518	4.36	4.18	4.11	4.12	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	31	4.74	469/1472	4.74	4.65	4.46	4.53	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	162/1475	4.97	4.83	4.72	4.79	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	15	20	4.36	846/1471	4.36	4.42	4.32	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	10	23	4.42	788/1470	4.42	4.57	4.33	4.40	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	9	9	20	4.21	626/1310	4.21	4.38	4.06	4.19	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	9	4	7	3.73	940/1210	3.73	4.02	4.18	4.18	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	868/1211	4.14	4.28	4.37	4.34	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	800/1207	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.40	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	17	12	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	626/859	3.70	3.87	4.08	4.07	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 57
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View		Questionnaires: 39
Instructor:	School,Joseph		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	38/207	4.61	4.37	4.12	4.26	4.61
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	3	2	8	14	4.11	131/210	4.11	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	5	2	20	4.46	116/202	4.46	4.78	4.50	4.62	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	113/202	4.32	4.19	4.32	4.20	4.32
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	3	2	4	4	4	11	3.72	156/199	3.72	4.52	4.15	4.32	3.72
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	17/32	4.60	3.92	4.20	4.55	4.60
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	15/35	4.80	4.21	4.36	4.10	4.80
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	13/25	4.90	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.90
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	2	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 286 100	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	57
Title:	Expl Env: Geo-Spat View		Questionnaires:	39
Instructor:	School,Joseph			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	9	Under-grad	39	Non-major	36
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 40
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog			Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Ratcliffe,Micha			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	524/1542	4.55	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	466/1542	4.62	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	289/1339	4.75	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	21	4.65	369/1498	4.53	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	3	16	4.27	619/1428	4.21	3.99	4.12	4.15	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	297/1407	4.23	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	3	18	4.48	546/1521	4.58	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1541	4.95	4.75	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	253/1518	4.48	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	288/1472	4.83	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	430/1475	4.94	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	186/1471	4.81	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	203/1470	4.83	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	344/1310	4.57	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	266/1210	4.73	4.02	4.18	4.27	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	377/1211	4.73	4.28	4.37	4.45	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.37	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 302 01	**Term - Spring 2012**	**Enrollment: 40**
Title: Selected Topics In Geog		**Questionnaires: 27**
Instructor: Ratcliffe,Micha		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	420/859	4.15	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.15

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	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 3		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 43			
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog											Questionnaires: 29			
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Caro														

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	17	4.50	632/1542	4.55	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	8	19	4.61	492/1542	4.62	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	361/1339	4.75	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	688/1498	4.53	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	12	11	4.14	747/1428	4.21	3.99	4.12	4.15	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	5	9	9	3.85	1013/1407	4.23	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	317/1521	4.58	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	705/1541	4.95	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	629/1518	4.48	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	351/1472	4.83	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	215/1475	4.94	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	359/1471	4.81	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	24	4.78	349/1470	4.83	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	201/1310	4.57	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1210	4.73	4.02	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1211	4.73	4.28	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1207	5.00	4.37	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 302 3	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	43
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog		Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Caro			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	4.15	3.87	4.08	4.13	****

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	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	23
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 305 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	28
Title:	Landscape Ecology										Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C											

				Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	608/1542	4.53	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	799/1542	4.37	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	730/1339	4.37	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1199/1498	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.32	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	821/1428	4.05	3.99	4.12	4.15	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1256/1407	3.40	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	150/1521	4.84	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	413/1541	4.95	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18	773/1518	4.18	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	503/1472	4.72	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	592/1475	4.89	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	809/1471	4.39	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	498/1470	4.67	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	832/1310	3.94	4.38	4.06	4.11	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	966/1210	3.67	4.02	4.18	4.27	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	739/1211	4.33	4.28	4.37	4.45	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.37	4.41	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 305 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 28
Title:	Landscape Ecology		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Ellis,Erle C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 310 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 40
Title: Geomorphology		Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Gellis,Allen		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	706/1542	4.45	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	15	10	4.13	1060/1542	4.13	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	10	13	4.06	958/1339	4.06	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	11	5	7	3.64	1290/1498	3.64	4.25	4.26	4.32	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	4	9	2	8	3.00	1360/1428	3.00	3.99	4.12	4.15	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	3	4	4	5	3.39	1262/1407	3.39	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	5	16	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	4.65	1011/1541	4.65	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	9	11	4	3.62	1242/1518	3.62	4.18	4.11	4.13	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	9	18	4.32	1032/1472	4.32	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	808/1475	4.81	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	6	8	12	3.81	1224/1471	3.81	4.42	4.32	4.33	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	11	14	4.16	1030/1470	4.16	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	239/1310	4.61	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1210	****	4.02	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1211	****	4.28	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1207	****	4.37	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 310 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 40
Title: Geomorphology				Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Gellis,Allen				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 314 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 41			
Title: Geography Of Soils										Questionnaires: 38			
Instructor: Walker,Charles													

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	28	4.71	372/1542	4.71	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	24	4.55	553/1542	4.55	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	11	22	4.39	703/1339	4.39	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	11	20	4.40	688/1498	4.40	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	8	12	12	3.71	1126/1428	3.71	3.99	4.12	4.15	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	3	1	2	10	4.19	757/1407	4.19	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	29	4.68	304/1521	4.68	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	22	15	4.34	1260/1541	4.34	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	19	14	4.38	521/1518	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	319/1472	4.84	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	323/1475	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	30	4.81	268/1471	4.81	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	190/1470	4.89	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	11	24	4.69	186/1310	4.69	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/1210	****	4.02	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	****/1211	****	4.28	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/1207	****	4.37	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 314 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 41			
Title:	Geography Of Soils									Questionnaires: 38			
Instructor:	Walker,Charles												

				Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	2.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 314 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 41
Title:	Geography Of Soils			Questionnaires: 38
Instructor:	Walker,Charles			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	34
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 342 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 41	
Title: Metropolitan Baltimore					Questionnaires: 28	
Instructor: Bennett,Sari J						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	572/1542	4.56	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	5	13	4.00	1122/1542	4.00	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	7	13	4.15	904/1339	4.15	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	4	5	14	4.15	956/1498	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	9	12	4.15	747/1428	4.15	3.99	4.12	4.15	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	11	3	10	3.77	1075/1407	3.77	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	5	12	3.96	1083/1521	3.96	4.39	4.20	4.23	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	1140/1541	4.48	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	3	5	10	5	3.74	1172/1518	3.74	4.18	4.11	4.13	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	18	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	700/1475	4.85	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	8	11	4.04	1087/1471	4.04	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	17	4.44	764/1470	4.44	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	2	1	4	16	4.20	626/1310	4.20	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	989/1210	3.60	4.02	4.18	4.27	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	1	2	0	5	3.50	1100/1211	3.50	4.28	4.37	4.45	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.37	4.41	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	440/859	4.13	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 342 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 41			
Title:	Metropolitan Baltimore										Questionnaires: 28			
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	2.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 342 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	41
Title:	Metropolitan Baltimore					Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Bennett,Sari J						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 363 01						Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 37	
Title:	World Regions: Cont Iss											Questionnaires: 28	
Instructor:	Steele,Christop												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	620/1542	4.52	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	602/1542	4.52	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	289/1339	4.78	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	404/1498	4.63	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	410/1428	4.48	3.99	4.12	4.15	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	559/1407	4.37	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	15	4.30	795/1521	4.30	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	2	4.07	1436/1541	4.07	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	753/1518	4.19	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	659/1472	4.63	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	673/1475	4.85	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	587/1471	4.56	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	387/1470	4.74	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	82/1310	4.88	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	602/1210	4.30	4.02	4.18	4.27	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	886/1211	4.10	4.28	4.37	4.45	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	630/1207	4.50	4.37	4.41	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	618/859	3.73	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 363 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 37			
Title: World Regions: Cont Iss										Questionnaires: 28			
Instructor: Steele,Christop													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	2.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 363 01			Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 37			
Title:	**World Regions: Cont Iss**										**Questionnaires: 28**			
Instructor:	**Steele,Christop**													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 383 1		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	20			
Title:	Stat/Thematic Cartogrphy										Questionnaires:	19			
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom														

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	572/1542	4.56	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1026/1542	4.17	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	841/1339	4.24	4.44	4.32	4.36	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	986/1498	4.13	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1275/1428	3.38	3.99	4.12	4.15	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	832/1407	4.09	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	602/1521	4.44	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	10	2	3.82	1114/1518	3.82	4.18	4.11	4.13	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	319/1472	4.83	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	809/1471	4.39	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	640/1470	4.56	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	566/1310	4.27	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	774/1210	4.00	4.02	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	764/1211	4.31	4.28	4.37	4.45	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	866/1207	4.15	4.37	4.41	4.51	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	770/859	3.33	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 383 1	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Stat/Thematic Cartogrphy			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Rabenhorst,Thom				

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 1		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 29				
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems										Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor:	School,Joseph														

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	572/1542	4.56	4.55	4.33	4.37	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	810/1542	4.35	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	2	6	3.61	1180/1339	3.61	4.44	4.32	4.36	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	428/1498	4.60	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	0	3	7	2	2.94	1375/1428	2.94	3.99	4.12	4.15	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1144/1407	3.63	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	463/1521	4.56	4.39	4.20	4.23	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	721/1541	4.89	4.75	4.70	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	802/1518	4.14	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	418/1472	4.78	4.65	4.46	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	1105/1475	4.61	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1015/1471	4.17	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	834/1470	4.39	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	495/1310	4.33	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	966/1210	3.67	4.02	4.18	4.27	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.45	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	499/1207	4.67	4.37	4.41	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 1		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 29			
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems										Questionnaires: 18			
Instructor:	School,Joseph													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.37	4.12	4.17	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	49/210	4.50	4.39	4.17	4.21	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.78	4.50	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	183/202	3.50	4.19	4.32	4.44	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/199	5.00	4.52	4.15	4.18	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	2.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 386 1		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Geog Info Systems					Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	School,Joseph						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 400 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 23
Title: Selected Topics In Geog				Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Holland,Margare				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	322/1542	4.75	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	297/1542	4.75	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1339	4.75	4.44	4.32	4.44	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	333/1498	4.69	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	137/1428	4.81	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	345/1407	4.56	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	452/1521	4.56	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	738/1541	4.88	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	227/1518	4.69	4.18	4.11	4.18	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	452/1472	4.75	4.65	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	438/1471	4.69	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	217/1470	4.88	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	231/1310	4.63	4.38	4.06	4.09	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	290/1210	4.70	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	415/1211	4.70	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	461/1207	4.70	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 400 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 23
Title:	Selected Topics In Geog			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Holland,Margare			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	273/859	4.40	3.87	4.08	4.19	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 406 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Aquatic Ecology			Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Swan,Christophe			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	322/1542	4.75	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	492/1542	4.60	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	694/1339	4.40	4.44	4.32	4.44	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	549/1498	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	943/1407	3.93	4.04	4.15	4.30	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	630/1521	4.42	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	705/1541	4.89	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	822/1518	4.13	4.18	4.11	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	728/1472	4.58	4.65	4.46	4.50	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	987/1475	4.70	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	755/1471	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	468/1470	4.68	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	698/1310	4.12	4.38	4.06	4.09	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1210	****	4.02	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1211	****	4.28	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1207	****	4.37	4.41	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 406 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Aquatic Ecology		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Swan,Christophe		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/207	4.67	4.37	4.12	4.41	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	36/210	4.63	4.39	4.17	4.02	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.78	4.50	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	89/202	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.23	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	47/199	4.63	4.52	4.15	3.77	4.63
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 415 1		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title: Climate Change				Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Halverson,Jeffr				

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	1	14	4.56	572/1542	4.56	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	776/1542	4.39	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	649/1339	4.44	4.44	4.32	4.44	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	790/1498	4.31	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	452/1428	4.44	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	740/1407	4.20	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	560/1521	4.47	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	937/1541	4.72	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	812/1518	4.13	4.18	4.11	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	240/1472	4.89	4.65	4.46	4.50	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	463/1471	4.67	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	361/1470	4.76	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	239/1310	4.61	4.38	4.06	4.09	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	654/1210	4.22	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	267/1207	4.88	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 415 1		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Climate Change				Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Halverson,Jeffr					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 419 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 13
Title:	Watershed Analysis			Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Baker,Matthew E			

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	11	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	904/1542	4.27	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	638/1339	4.45	4.44	4.32	4.44	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	833/1498	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	204/1428	4.73	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1045/1407	3.82	4.04	4.15	4.30	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	1	1	3.00	1434/1521	3.00	4.39	4.20	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1166/1541	4.45	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	334/1518	4.56	4.18	4.11	4.18	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1353/1472	3.73	4.65	4.46	4.50	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	538/1475	4.91	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1258/1471	3.73	4.42	4.32	4.36	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	412/1470	4.73	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	658/1310	4.17	4.38	4.06	4.09	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1210	4.00	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1211	4.67	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.37	4.41	4.53	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 419 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 13
Title: Watershed Analysis		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Baker,Matthew E		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 428 01							Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 22			
Title: Sci Prac & Env Pol												Questionnaires: 18			
Instructor: Lansing,David															

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	6	8	4.22	995/1542	4.22	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1173/1542	3.94	4.41	4.29	4.33	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	757/1339	4.33	4.44	4.32	4.44	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	1032/1498	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	345/1428	4.56	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	819/1407	4.11	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	817/1521	4.28	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	884/1541	4.78	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1015/1518	3.94	4.18	4.11	4.18	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1266/1472	3.94	4.65	4.46	4.50	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	861/1475	4.78	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1054/1471	4.11	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	943/1470	4.28	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	8	3	5	3.81	917/1310	3.81	4.38	4.06	4.09	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	744/1210	4.09	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	889/1211	4.09	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 428 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 22
Title:	Sci Prac & Env Pol					Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Lansing,David					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	547/859	3.90	3.87	4.08	4.19	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	2	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 462 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 14
Title: Human-Environment Gis		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Neff,Robert		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	322/1542	4.75	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	416/1542	4.67	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.44	4.32	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	128/1498	4.91	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	629/1428	4.25	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1407	4.56	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	430/1521	4.58	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1124/1541	4.50	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	445/1518	4.44	4.18	4.11	4.18	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	715/1472	4.58	4.65	4.46	4.50	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	870/1471	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	886/1470	4.33	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	711/1310	4.09	4.38	4.06	4.09	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	726/1210	4.13	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.37	4.41	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	361/859	4.25	3.87	4.08	4.19	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 462 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	14
Title:	Human-Environment Gis				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Neff,Robert					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.02	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.23	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 481 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 6
Title: Digital Image Processing				**Questionnaires: 5**
Instructor: Tang,Junmei				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	512/1542	4.60	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1278/1542	3.80	4.41	4.29	4.33	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	694/1339	4.40	4.44	4.32	4.44	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1058/1498	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1061/1428	3.80	3.99	4.12	4.22	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	658/1521	4.40	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1248/1518	3.60	4.18	4.11	4.18	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	954/1472	4.40	4.65	4.46	4.50	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1119/1475	4.60	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1308/1471	3.60	4.42	4.32	4.36	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1108/1470	4.00	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	948/1310	3.75	4.38	4.06	4.09	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	924/1210	3.75	4.02	4.18	4.34	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1097/1207	3.50	4.37	4.41	4.53	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 481 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 6
Title:	Digital Image Processing			Questionnaires: 5
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei			

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	843/859	2.50	3.87	4.08	4.19	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 486 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 15				
Title:	Adv Appl Geog Info Sys										Questionnaires: 11				
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1034/1542	4.18	4.55	4.33	4.42	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1009/1542	4.18	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1054/1339	3.91	4.44	4.32	4.44	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	833/1498	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.35	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1156/1428	3.67	3.99	4.12	4.22	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	997/1407	3.88	4.04	4.15	4.30	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	369/1521	4.64	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	689/1541	4.91	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1315/1518	3.44	4.18	4.11	4.18	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	503/1472	4.73	4.65	4.46	4.50	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1079/1475	4.64	4.83	4.72	4.74	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	930/1471	4.27	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	943/1470	4.27	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	606/1310	4.22	4.38	4.06	4.09	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1123/1210	3.00	4.02	4.18	4.34	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.47	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1207	4.25	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/859	****	3.87	4.08	4.19	****

Run Date: 6/29/2012 9:37:00 AM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 486 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 15			
Title:	Adv Appl Geog Info Sys										Questionnaires: 11			
Instructor:	Tang,Junmei													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.02	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.23	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 673 1		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 15				
Title:	Geoprocessing & Spat Ana										Questionnaires: 14				
Instructor:	Young,Paul M														

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	461/1542	4.64	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	726/1542	4.43	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	801/1339	4.29	4.44	4.32	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	660/1498	4.43	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	958/1428	3.93	3.99	4.12	4.13	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1013/1407	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	441/1521	4.57	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1199/1541	4.42	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	341/1518	4.55	4.18	4.11	4.15	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	288/1472	4.86	4.65	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	843/1475	4.79	4.83	4.72	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	488/1471	4.64	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	788/1470	4.43	4.57	4.33	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	404/1310	4.43	4.38	4.06	3.99	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	538/1210	4.38	4.02	4.18	4.28	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	809/1211	4.23	4.28	4.37	4.51	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	607/1207	4.54	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	540/859	3.92	3.87	4.08	4.08	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 673 1	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 15
Title:	Geoprocessing & Spat Ana			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Young,Paul M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/207	4.75	4.37	4.12	4.20	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/210	****	4.39	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.24	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.48	4.60	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.57	4.50	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.55	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.37	4.17	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	4.08	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.42	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 673 1		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	15
Title:	Geoprocessing & Spat Ana				Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Young,Paul M					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	7	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 675 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 16	
Title:	GIS Application Developm					Questionnaires: 12	
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	435/1542	4.67	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	833/1542	4.33	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	582/1339	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1012/1498	4.09	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.99	4.12	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1210/1407	3.50	4.04	4.15	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	2	5	3.67	1257/1521	3.67	4.39	4.20	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1242/1541	4.36	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	822/1518	4.13	4.18	4.11	4.15	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	715/1472	4.58	4.65	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	951/1475	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1104/1471	4.00	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	886/1470	4.33	4.57	4.33	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	201/1310	4.67	4.38	4.06	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	733/1210	4.11	4.02	4.18	4.28	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	739/1211	4.33	4.28	4.37	4.51	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	593/1207	4.56	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	216/859	4.50	3.87	4.08	4.08	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 675 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	16
Title:	GIS Application Developm			Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	106/207	4.20	4.37	4.12	4.20	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	157/210	3.80	4.39	4.17	4.12	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	104/202	4.50	4.78	4.50	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	178/202	3.75	4.19	4.32	4.24	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/199	4.75	4.52	4.15	4.30	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	57/69	4.20	4.24	4.56	4.62	4.20
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	38/69	4.75	4.48	4.60	4.71	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	50/68	4.20	4.57	4.50	4.55	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/73	4.75	4.55	4.54	4.54	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	40/67	4.20	4.37	4.17	4.35	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	29/32	2.50	3.92	4.20	4.06	2.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	27/35	3.75	4.21	4.36	4.40	3.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	23/30	3.75	4.08	4.27	4.36	3.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	24/29	3.80	4.12	4.29	4.42	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 675 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	16	
Title:	GIS Application Developm										Questionnaires:	12	
Instructor:	Yang,Xiuzhu												

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/18	****	4.22	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 679 2			Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 14			
Title:	Professional Seminar									Questionnaires: 8			
Instructor:	Kalweit,Susan W												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	297/1542	4.75	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.44	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	549/1498	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	117/1428	4.86	3.99	4.12	4.13	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	559/1407	4.38	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	382/1521	4.63	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	494/1518	4.40	4.18	4.11	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.65	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1471	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.57	4.33	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	270/1310	4.57	4.38	4.06	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1210	4.88	4.02	4.18	4.28	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.28	4.37	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.37	4.41	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	173/859	4.63	3.87	4.08	4.08	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 679 2		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 14
Title: Professional Seminar				Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Kalweit,Susan W				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.37	4.12	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/210	4.50	4.39	4.17	4.12	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.78	4.50	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.19	4.32	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.52	4.15	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	4.24	4.56	4.62	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	4.48	4.60	4.71	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/68	5.00	4.57	4.50	4.55	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.55	4.54	4.54	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/67	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.35	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.92	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.21	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.73	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.39	4.41	4.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	15/30	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.36	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	4.17	4.57	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 679 2		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 14
Title:	Professional Seminar					Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Kalweit,Susan W					

					Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.12	4.29	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	3	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	5	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 771 1	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 7
Title: Advanced Spatial DBM		**Questionnaires: 6**
Instructor: Evans,Owen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	869/1542	4.33	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	582/1339	4.50	4.44	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1346/1498	3.50	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	390/1428	4.50	3.99	4.12	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	746/1521	4.33	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	994/1541	4.67	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	244/1518	4.67	4.18	4.11	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.65	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1471	4.50	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	498/1470	4.67	4.57	4.33	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	201/1310	4.67	4.38	4.06	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	884/1210	3.83	4.02	4.18	4.28	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1211	4.67	4.28	4.37	4.51	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	311/1207	4.83	4.37	4.41	4.53	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	713/859	3.50	3.87	4.08	4.08	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 771 1				Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 7		
Title:	Advanced Spatial DBM										Questionnaires: 6		
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	60/207	4.50	4.37	4.12	4.20	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/210	4.50	4.39	4.17	4.12	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.78	4.50	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	89/202	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/199	4.50	4.52	4.15	4.30	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	58/69	4.00	4.24	4.56	4.62	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	60/69	4.00	4.48	4.60	4.71	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/68	5.00	4.57	4.50	4.55	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.55	4.54	4.54	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/67	4.00	4.37	4.17	4.35	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	29/32	2.50	3.92	4.20	4.06	2.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	29/35	3.50	4.21	4.36	4.40	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/25	4.50	4.73	4.59	4.53	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/23	4.50	4.39	4.41	4.39	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	24/30	3.50	4.08	4.27	4.36	3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/19	4.50	4.17	4.57	4.45	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	19/29	4.00	4.12	4.29	4.42	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 771 1	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 7
Title:	Advanced Spatial DBM			Questionnaires: 6
Instructor:	Evans,Owen J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	13/18	4.00	4.22	4.25	4.35	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	10
Title:	GIS Data Sources					Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	297/1542	4.78	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1542	4.67	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	529/1339	4.56	4.44	4.32	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	996/1498	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	769/1428	4.13	3.99	4.12	4.13	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	599/1407	4.33	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	382/1521	4.63	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	994/1541	4.67	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	278/1518	4.40	4.18	4.11	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	240/1472	4.78	4.65	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	861/1475	4.64	4.83	4.72	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	463/1471	4.50	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	349/1470	4.64	4.57	4.33	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	324/1310	4.35	4.38	4.06	3.99	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	546/1210	4.38	4.02	4.18	4.28	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1001/1211	3.88	4.28	4.37	4.51	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1071/1207	3.63	4.37	4.41	4.53	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	678/859	3.60	3.87	4.08	4.08	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 01		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment:	10
Title:	GIS Data Sources							Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim								

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	186/207	3.33	4.37	4.12	4.20	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	94/210	4.33	4.39	4.17	4.12	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	81/202	4.67	4.78	4.50	4.23	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	148/202	4.00	4.19	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	89/199	4.33	4.52	4.15	4.30	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	58/69	4.00	4.24	4.56	4.62	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	55/69	4.33	4.48	4.60	4.71	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	47/68	4.33	4.57	4.50	4.55	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	57/73	4.00	4.55	4.54	4.54	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	36/67	4.33	4.37	4.17	4.35	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/32	5.00	3.92	4.20	4.06	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	18/35	4.50	4.21	4.36	4.40	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	16/25	4.75	4.73	4.59	4.53	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	16/23	4.33	4.39	4.41	4.39	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	19/30	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.36	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	15/19	4.00	4.17	4.57	4.45	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/29	4.33	4.12	4.29	4.42	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	10
Title:	GIS Data Sources			Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Abdullah,Qassim				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	12/18	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.35	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 10				
Title:	GIS Data Sources									Questionnaires: 10				
Instructor:	May,Nora C													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	297/1542	4.78	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1542	4.67	4.41	4.29	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	529/1339	4.56	4.44	4.32	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	996/1498	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	769/1428	4.13	3.99	4.12	4.13	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	599/1407	4.33	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	382/1521	4.63	4.39	4.20	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	994/1541	4.67	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	783/1518	4.40	4.18	4.11	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	598/1472	4.78	4.65	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1197/1475	4.64	4.83	4.72	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	870/1471	4.50	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	692/1470	4.64	4.57	4.33	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	626/1310	4.35	4.38	4.06	3.99	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	546/1210	4.38	4.02	4.18	4.28	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1001/1211	3.88	4.28	4.37	4.51	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1071/1207	3.63	4.37	4.41	4.53	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	678/859	3.60	3.87	4.08	4.08	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	GES 776 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	10
Title:	GIS Data Sources			Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	May,Nora C				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	186/207	3.33	4.37	4.12	4.20	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	94/210	4.33	4.39	4.17	4.12	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	81/202	4.67	4.78	4.50	4.23	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	148/202	4.00	4.19	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	89/199	4.33	4.52	4.15	4.30	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	58/69	4.00	4.24	4.56	4.62	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	55/69	4.33	4.48	4.60	4.71	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	47/68	4.33	4.57	4.50	4.55	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	57/73	4.00	4.55	4.54	4.54	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	36/67	4.33	4.37	4.17	4.35	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/32	5.00	3.92	4.20	4.06	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	18/35	4.50	4.21	4.36	4.40	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	16/25	4.75	4.73	4.59	4.53	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	16/23	4.33	4.39	4.41	4.39	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	19/30	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.36	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	15/19	4.00	4.17	4.57	4.45	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	18/29	4.33	4.12	4.29	4.42	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: GES 776 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 10
Title: GIS Data Sources		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: May,Nora C		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	12/18	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.35	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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