

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0101  
 Title GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 104  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 802  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	16	18	4.09	1018/1481	4.35	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	18	24	4.37	704/1481	4.43	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	8	28	4.33	687/1249	4.20	4.52	4.27	4.14	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	1	7	6	12	4.00	959/1424	3.98	4.40	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	10	1	10	12	11	3.30	1184/1396	3.90	3.88	3.98	3.89	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1106/1342	3.53	4.24	4.07	3.88	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	6	33	4.51	448/1459	4.70	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	28	17	4.30	1178/1480	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	10	21	9	3.97	877/1450	4.06	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	36	4.76	400/1409	4.83	4.63	4.42	4.36	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	38	4.80	728/1407	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	6	31	4.44	636/1399	4.59	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	9	34	4.63	456/1400	4.66	4.52	4.27	4.19	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	13	31	4.64	187/1179	4.44	4.52	3.96	3.85	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	8	12	11	3.88	810/1262	4.03	4.10	4.05	3.77	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	3	5	24	4.47	615/1259	4.25	4.30	4.29	4.06	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	5	27	4.74	382/1256	4.46	4.57	4.30	4.08	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	20	3	1	2	5	3	3.29	684/ 788	3.29	3.98	4.00	3.80	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 3	A 16	Required for Majors 27	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 16		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 6	Under-grad 46 Non-major 44
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course-Section: GEOG 102 0201  
 Title: GEOG OF HUMAN ACTIVITI  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 803  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	17	18	4.43	639/1481	4.35	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	13	20	4.38	693/1481	4.43	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	12	14	3.97	919/1249	4.20	4.52	4.27	4.14	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	28	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	****/1424	3.98	4.40	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	14	16	4.22	536/1396	3.90	3.88	3.98	3.89	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	32	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1342	3.53	4.24	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	125/1459	4.70	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	17	19	4.53	1034/1480	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	23	8	4.05	808/1450	4.06	3.87	4.09	3.97	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	35	4.92	169/1409	4.83	4.63	4.42	4.36	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	300/1407	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	322/1399	4.59	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	501/1400	4.66	4.52	4.27	4.19	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	4	2	12	18	4.22	464/1179	4.44	4.52	3.96	3.85	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	8	2	11	3.83	842/1262	4.03	4.10	4.05	3.77	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	2	6	5	9	3.71	1059/1259	4.25	4.30	4.29	4.06	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	2	5	2	14	4.08	868/1256	4.46	4.57	4.30	4.08	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	20	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 788	3.29	3.98	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.33	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.17	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.48	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	7
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	18
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	23	Graduate
			General	5	Under-grad
			Electives	2	Major
			Other	5	Non-major
					36
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	4	16	38	4.53	531/1481	4.35	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	14	40	4.54	469/1481	4.43	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	6	22	29	4.31	703/1249	4.20	4.52	4.27	4.14	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	38	1	1	3	9	7	3.95	1023/1424	3.98	4.40	4.21	4.06	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	4	5	18	26	4.19	564/1396	3.90	3.88	3.98	3.89	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	44	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	****/1342	3.53	4.24	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	10	46	4.72	217/1459	4.70	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	49	4.84	784/1480	4.56	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	1	4	19	15	4.15	732/1450	4.06	3.87	4.09	3.97	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	10	46	4.82	304/1409	4.83	4.63	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	7	50	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	3	11	41	4.63	431/1399	4.59	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	5	47	4.75	324/1400	4.66	4.52	4.27	4.19	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	3	16	33	4.44	307/1179	4.44	4.52	3.96	3.85	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	1	2	6	28	4.38	467/1262	4.03	4.10	4.05	3.77	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	3	7	29	4.57	532/1259	4.25	4.30	4.29	4.06	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	0	1	8	29	4.55	543/1256	4.46	4.57	4.30	4.08	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	29	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	****/ 788	3.29	3.98	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.18	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.43	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 7	Required for Majors	33
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 28		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 8	C 13	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Under-grad 61
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Non-major 59
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	8
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: GEOG 105 0101  
 Title WORLD REGIONAL GEOG (S)  
 Instructor: STEELE, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 805  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	1	2	9	16	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	9	11	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.35	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	12	12	4.07	869/1249	4.07	4.52	4.27	4.14	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	0	7	6	9	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	4.40	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	6	19	4.37	411/1396	4.37	3.88	3.98	3.89	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	4	15	4.03	737/1342	4.03	4.24	4.07	3.88	4.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	10	6	10	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	12	4.37	1139/1480	4.37	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	1	0	7	9	4	3.71	1133/1450	3.71	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	8	12	6	3.75	1251/1409	3.75	4.63	4.42	4.36	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	1046/1407	4.59	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	13	8	3.93	1077/1399	3.93	4.47	4.26	4.23	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	0	3	9	10	3.92	1074/1400	3.92	4.52	4.27	4.19	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	7	20	4.52	253/1179	4.52	4.52	3.96	3.85	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	477/1262	4.37	4.10	4.05	3.77	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	2	14	4.47	615/1259	4.47	4.30	4.29	4.06	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	532/1256	4.58	4.57	4.30	4.08	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	7	3	5	3.69	558/ 788	3.69	3.98	4.00	3.80	3.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	3.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	11
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	1
				Required for Majors	10
				General	7
				Electives	3
				Other	5
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: GEOG 110 0101  
 Title GEOG OF ENV SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: KIRKHAM, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 806  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	792/1481	4.37	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	9	10	4.21	876/1481	4.28	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	561/1249	4.50	4.52	4.27	4.14	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	416/1424	4.26	4.40	4.21	4.06	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	6	6	9	3.87	831/1396	4.02	3.88	3.98	3.89	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	565/1342	4.22	4.24	4.07	3.88	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	6	2	16	4.42	595/1459	4.51	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	20	4	4.17	1281/1480	4.57	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	6	8	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.96	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	290/1409	4.67	4.63	4.42	4.36	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	1031/1407	4.72	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	545/1399	4.42	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	385/1400	4.59	4.52	4.27	4.19	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	218/1179	4.58	4.52	3.96	3.85	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	810/1262	3.70	4.10	4.05	3.77	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1113/1259	3.84	4.30	4.29	4.06	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	992/1256	4.11	4.57	4.30	4.08	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 1 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	5	8	31	4.46	613/1481	4.37	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	13	25	4.35	725/1481	4.28	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	8	32	4.54	460/1249	4.50	4.52	4.27	4.14	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	32	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	959/1424	4.26	4.40	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	8	10	22	4.16	584/1396	4.02	3.88	3.98	3.89	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	36	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	****/1342	4.22	4.24	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	5	36	4.61	344/1459	4.51	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	44	4.98	211/1480	4.57	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	4	21	13	4.18	712/1450	3.96	3.87	4.09	3.97	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	11	29	4.51	750/1409	4.67	4.63	4.42	4.36	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	39	4.84	636/1407	4.72	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	7	8	27	4.31	773/1399	4.42	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	1	9	31	4.49	613/1400	4.59	4.52	4.27	4.19	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	2	8	33	4.58	223/1179	4.58	4.52	3.96	3.85	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	2	8	4	12	3.52	991/1262	3.70	4.10	4.05	3.77	3.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	5	11	14	4.23	803/1259	3.84	4.30	4.29	4.06	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	2	3	4	20	4.33	723/1256	4.11	4.57	4.30	4.08	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	24	4	0	2	0	1	2.14	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	4.66	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.43	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	4.66	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 110 0201  
 Title GEOG OF ENV SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 111  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 807  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	0	0	4	4	12	51	4.55	513/1481	4.55	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	2	10	20	38	4.30	779/1481	4.30	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	3	4	20	44	4.48	535/1249	4.48	4.52	4.27	4.14	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	47	0	2	4	7	11	4.13	885/1424	4.13	4.40	4.21	4.06	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	17	10	5	13	13	12	3.23	1210/1396	3.23	3.88	3.98	3.89	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	53	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	****/1342	****	4.24	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	2	8	17	43	4.44	550/1459	4.44	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	1	8	61	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	1	9	18	32	4.30	588/1450	4.30	3.87	4.09	3.97	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	12	56	4.80	350/1409	4.80	4.63	4.42	4.36	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	4	65	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.87	4.69	4.57	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	2	5	23	38	4.43	659/1399	4.43	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	10	56	4.77	299/1400	4.77	4.52	4.27	4.19	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	3	5	8	24	23	3.94	661/1179	3.94	4.52	3.96	3.85	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	4	12	9	9	3.33	1059/1262	3.33	4.10	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	1	2	9	7	20	4.10	867/1259	4.10	4.30	4.29	4.06	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	3	3	3	14	16	3.95	950/1256	3.95	4.57	4.30	4.08	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	41	28	1	1	5	0	4	3.45	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.66	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.43	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.66	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	



Course-Section: GEOG 120 0101  
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI  
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE  
 Enrollment: 121  
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 808  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	9	Under-grad	80	Non-major	80
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GEOG 206 0101  
 Title ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 809  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	16	4.84	203/1481	4.84	4.59	4.29	4.40	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	299/1481	4.68	4.35	4.23	4.29	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	14	4.53	479/1249	4.53	4.52	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.40	4.21	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	484/1396	4.28	3.88	3.98	3.94	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	974/1342	3.78	4.24	4.07	4.05	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	310/1459	4.63	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	2	4.11	1324/1480	4.11	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	741/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	500/1409	4.71	4.63	4.42	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	1130/1407	4.47	4.87	4.69	4.78	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	671/1399	4.41	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	836/1400	4.29	4.52	4.27	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	533/1179	4.13	4.52	3.96	4.05	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.10	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.57	4.30	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.98	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 220 0101  
 Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 810  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.59	4.29	4.40	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	801/1481	4.28	4.35	4.23	4.29	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.52	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	595/1424	4.38	4.40	4.21	4.28	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1250/1396	3.14	3.88	3.98	3.94	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	948/1342	3.81	4.24	4.07	4.05	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	473/1450	4.40	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	1001/1409	4.31	4.63	4.42	4.47	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.52	4.27	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	2	0	0	4	3.57	870/1179	3.57	4.52	3.96	4.05	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.10	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.43	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.57	4.30	4.28	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.98	4.00	3.98	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	61/ 246	4.63	4.90	4.20	4.51	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	143/ 249	4.11	4.62	4.11	4.32	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	58/ 242	4.78	4.90	4.40	4.63	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	64/ 240	4.75	4.90	4.20	4.58	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	177/ 217	3.38	4.66	4.04	4.28	3.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	4.69	4.30	4.67	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	38/ 51	3.78	4.43	4.00	4.07	3.78	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	2	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	25/ 36	4.43	4.78	4.60	4.64	4.43	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	22/ 41	4.38	4.66	4.26	4.69	4.38	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	17/ 31	4.60	4.88	4.42	4.80	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GEOG 280 0101  
 Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 811  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.59	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	422/1481	4.58	4.35	4.23	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.52	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	545/1424	4.42	4.40	4.21	4.28	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1036/1396	3.58	3.88	3.98	3.94	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	4.24	4.07	4.05	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	854/1459	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.92	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	304/1450	4.55	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	878/1409	4.42	4.63	4.42	4.47	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.52	4.27	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	208/1179	4.60	4.52	3.96	4.05	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.10	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	489/1259	4.63	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.57	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.98	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 246	4.80	4.90	4.20	4.51	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 249	4.80	4.62	4.11	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	91/ 240	4.60	4.90	4.20	4.58	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	106/ 217	4.25	4.66	4.04	4.28	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.43	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.66	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 280 0101  
 Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 811  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 301 0101  
 Title QUANT TECHNIQUES IN GE  
 Instructor: EARICKSON, ROBE  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 812  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	9	6	4.11	996/1481	4.11	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	682/1481	4.39	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	460/1249	4.55	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	594/1396	4.15	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	343/1342	4.47	4.24	4.07	4.12	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	332/1459	4.61	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	11	1	3.87	1005/1450	3.87	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	800/1409	4.47	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	882/1400	4.24	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	331/1179	4.41	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.66	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: GEOG 306 0101  
 Title FIELD ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 813  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	639/1249	4.38	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	582/1424	4.38	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	11	4.10	643/1396	4.10	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	364/1342	4.45	4.24	4.07	4.12	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	872/1459	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1326/1480	4.10	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	567/1450	4.32	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	804/1407	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	929/1399	4.14	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	882/1400	4.24	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	457/1179	4.24	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	1022/1259	3.82	4.30	4.29	4.34	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	4.57	4.30	4.34	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	29/ 246	4.86	4.90	4.20	4.20	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	139/ 249	4.14	4.62	4.11	4.23	4.14	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	89/ 242	4.64	4.90	4.40	4.36	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	85/ 240	4.64	4.90	4.20	3.96	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	137/ 217	3.93	4.66	4.04	4.11	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	26/ 59	4.83	4.69	4.30	4.48	4.83	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	25/ 51	4.22	4.43	4.00	4.13	4.22	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	5	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	27/ 36	4.00	4.78	4.60	4.33	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	3	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	29/ 41	3.57	4.66	4.26	3.90	3.57	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	9	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	17/ 31	4.57	4.88	4.42	4.00	4.57	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 306 0101  
 Title FIELD ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 813  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						



Course-Section: GEOG 310 0101  
 Title GEOMORPHOLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 814  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	496/1481	4.57	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	758/1481	4.32	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	12	4.22	773/1249	4.22	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	8	9	4.04	938/1424	4.04	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	801/1396	3.90	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	10	9	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.24	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	9	4	3.76	1148/1459	3.76	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	11	5	3.90	973/1450	3.90	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	990/1409	4.32	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	938/1399	4.14	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	647/1400	4.45	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	384/1179	4.33	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	779/1262	3.92	4.10	4.05	4.14	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	796/1259	4.23	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	832/1256	4.15	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	3.98	4.00	4.07	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.66	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.43	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.66	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 310 0101  
 Title GEOMORPHOLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 814  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GEOG 312 0101  
 Title BIOGEOCHEMICAL CYCLES  
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 815  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1481	4.88	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	502/1396	4.25	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	434/1342	4.38	4.24	4.07	4.12	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	321/1459	4.63	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	445/1450	4.43	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	231/1409	4.88	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1179	4.86	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 341 0101  
 Title URBAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 816  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	8	13	4.38	708/1481	4.38	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	9	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	796/1424	4.21	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	10	10	4.17	584/1396	4.17	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	7	10	4.09	707/1342	4.09	4.24	4.07	4.12	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	321/1459	4.63	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	4.54	1025/1480	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	3	12	2	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	1008/1407	4.63	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	1	8	12	4.22	864/1399	4.22	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	7	14	4.29	836/1400	4.29	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	0	8	11	4.04	576/1179	4.04	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	8	6	3.71	907/1262	3.71	4.10	4.05	4.14	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	821/1259	4.19	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	1	3	8	6	3.62	1081/1256	3.62	4.57	4.30	4.34	3.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	2	4	7	4	3.47	617/ 788	3.47	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.47	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	3.96	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.70	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	4.69	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.43	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.78	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.66	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	

Course-Section: GEOG 341 0101  
 Title URBAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 816  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 352 0101  
 Title GEOG OF CRIME & JUSTIC  
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 817  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	233/1481	4.81	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	203/1249	4.81	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1424	****	4.40	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	285/1396	4.52	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1342	****	4.24	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	351/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	189/1450	4.71	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	311/1399	4.71	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	299/1400	4.76	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	233/1179	4.56	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	631/1262	4.17	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 383 0101  
 Title STAT/THEMATIC CARTOGRP  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 818  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	469/1481	4.55	4.35	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.52	4.27	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.45	497/1424	4.45	4.40	4.21	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.24	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	281/1450	4.57	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	417/1399	4.64	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1400	4.91	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	821/1259	4.20	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.20	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/ 249	4.60	4.62	4.11	4.23	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	99/ 242	4.60	4.90	4.40	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	57/ 217	4.60	4.66	4.04	4.11	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.87	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.91	4.53	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.84	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.44	3.92	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 386 0101  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 819  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	801/1481	4.28	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	9	6	4.06	873/1249	4.06	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	695/1424	4.29	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	5	3	1	2	3	2.64	1354/1396	2.64	3.88	3.98	4.00	2.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	1155/1342	3.43	4.24	4.07	4.12	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1148/1459	3.76	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	4	4	3.56	1202/1450	3.56	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	839/1409	4.44	4.63	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	984/1399	4.06	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1001/1400	4.06	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	570/1179	4.06	4.52	3.96	4.02	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	810/1262	3.89	4.10	4.05	4.14	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	854/1256	4.11	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 246	4.36	4.90	4.20	4.20	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	89/ 249	4.45	4.62	4.11	4.23	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	91/ 242	4.64	4.90	4.40	4.36	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	71/ 240	4.73	4.90	4.20	3.96	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	75/ 217	4.44	4.66	4.04	4.11	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						



Course-Section: GEOG 400A 0101  
 Title: ATMOSPHERE\OCEAN:IMPAC  
 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 820  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	17	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	405/1249	4.61	4.52	4.27	4.44	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	7	7	3.86	1123/1424	3.86	4.40	4.21	4.35	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	4	1	4	1	3.20	1218/1396	3.20	3.88	3.98	4.09	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	9	5	3.65	1044/1342	3.65	4.24	4.07	4.21	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	595/1459	4.42	4.32	4.16	4.25	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1079/1480	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	304/1450	4.55	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.55	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	231/1409	4.88	4.63	4.42	4.51	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.47	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.52	4.27	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.52	3.96	4.07	4.50	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	976/1262	3.56	4.10	4.05	4.33	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	861/1259	4.11	4.30	4.29	4.57	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	636/1256	4.44	4.57	4.30	4.60	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	10
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GEOG 400B 0101  
 Title CONTEMP INTL ISSUES  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 821  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.35	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.86	4.40	4.21	4.35	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.88	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.24	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	580/1459	4.43	4.32	4.16	4.25	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1450	5.00	3.87	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.63	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.47	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.52	4.27	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.52	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.10	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.87	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.91	4.53	4.64	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/ 63	4.83	4.70	4.44	4.49	4.83	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	28/ 69	4.86	4.84	4.35	4.53	4.86	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	27/ 68	4.57	4.44	3.92	4.10	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 405 0101  
 Title APP LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 822  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.59	4.29	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.52	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	4.40	4.21	4.35	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.88	3.98	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.24	4.07	4.21	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1125/1459	3.80	4.32	4.16	4.25	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	630/1450	4.25	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.63	4.42	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.47	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.52	4.27	4.38	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.52	3.96	4.07	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.66	4.04	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	4.69	4.30	4.93	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.43	4.00	4.56	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.78	4.60	4.91	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/ 41	4.67	4.66	4.26	4.72	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.88	4.42	4.83	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 413 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN BIOGEOGRAPH  
 Instructor: KIRKHAM, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 823  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.59	4.29	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1454/1481	2.80	4.35	4.23	4.32	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1343/1424	3.20	4.40	4.21	4.35	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1396	4.80	3.88	3.98	4.09	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	4.24	4.07	4.21	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1337/1459	3.25	4.32	4.16	4.25	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2.00	1478/1480	2.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	2.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1285/1450	3.33	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.63	4.42	4.51	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	4.47	4.26	4.36	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	4.52	4.27	4.38	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.10	4.05	4.33	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.60	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	48/ 68	4.40	4.87	4.49	4.68	4.40	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	48/ 69	4.40	4.91	4.53	4.64	4.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	62/ 63	3.20	4.70	4.44	4.49	3.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	43/ 69	4.20	4.84	4.35	4.53	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	54/ 68	3.20	4.44	3.92	4.10	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 450 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL GEOG  
 Instructor: HARRIES, KEITH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 824  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	1	7	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.59	4.29	4.45	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	704/1481	4.36	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.52	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1424	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.35	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.88	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	364/1342	4.44	4.24	4.07	4.21	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1071/1459	3.88	4.32	4.16	4.25	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	259/1450	4.60	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.63	4.42	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.79	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.47	4.26	4.36	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	468/1400	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.38	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	134/1179	4.75	4.52	3.96	4.07	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	631/1262	4.17	4.10	4.05	4.33	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	42/ 68	4.67	4.87	4.49	4.68	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.91	4.53	4.64	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/ 63	4.83	4.70	4.44	4.49	4.83	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	28/ 69	4.83	4.84	4.35	4.53	4.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	52/ 68	3.33	4.44	3.92	4.10	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 480 0101  
 Title ADV CARTOGRAPHIC APPL  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 825  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.59	4.29	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.52	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.40	4.21	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1297/1459	3.40	4.32	4.16	4.25	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1114/1480	4.40	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	630/1450	4.25	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.63	4.42	4.51	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.87	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1163/1399	3.75	4.47	4.26	4.36	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1256/1400	3.40	4.52	4.27	4.38	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	4.52	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.10	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.57	4.30	4.60	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	450/1481	4.61	4.59	4.29	4.45	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	843/1481	4.24	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.52	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	595/1424	4.38	4.40	4.21	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.88	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	277/1342	4.55	4.24	4.07	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	6	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.32	4.16	4.25	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	761/1450	4.13	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.63	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.87	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	901/1399	4.18	4.47	4.26	4.36	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.52	4.27	4.38	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	152/1179	4.71	4.52	3.96	4.07	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	877/1262	3.78	4.10	4.05	4.33	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	856/1259	4.13	4.30	4.29	4.57	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.57	4.30	4.60	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 788	****	3.98	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	4.90	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.62	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	****	4.90	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.90	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.66	4.04	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 827  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.63	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.47	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.52	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.50	4.62	4.11	3.93	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.87	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.91	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.70	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.44	3.92	3.71	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 59	4.50	4.69	4.30	4.01	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.43	4.00	3.81	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.78	4.60	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.66	4.26	4.27	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.88	4.42	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	



Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 827  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 828  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.63	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.47	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.52	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.50	4.62	4.11	3.93	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.87	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.91	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.70	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.44	3.92	3.71	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 59	4.50	4.69	4.30	4.01	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.43	4.00	3.81	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.78	4.60	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.66	4.26	4.27	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.88	4.42	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 828  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 829  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.63	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.47	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.52	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.50	4.62	4.11	3.93	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.87	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.91	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.70	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.44	3.92	3.71	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 59	4.50	4.69	4.30	4.01	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.43	4.00	3.81	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.78	4.60	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.66	4.26	4.27	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.88	4.42	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 829  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 830  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.63	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.47	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.52	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.50	4.62	4.11	3.93	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.87	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.91	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.70	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.44	3.92	3.71	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 59	4.50	4.69	4.30	4.01	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.43	4.00	3.81	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.78	4.60	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.66	4.26	4.27	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.88	4.42	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	

Course-Section: GEOG 605 0101  
 Title APPL LANDSCAPE ECOLOG  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 830  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 687 0101  
 Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS  
 Instructor: SOHN, YOUNGSINN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 831  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	1.92	3.87	4.09	3.96	1.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.63	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.47	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.52	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.10	4.05	4.07	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.62	4.11	3.93	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: GEOG 687 0101  
 Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 832  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1447/1450	1.92	3.87	4.09	3.96	1.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.10	4.05	4.07	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.62	4.11	3.93	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 687 0101  
 Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 833  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1447/1450	1.92	3.87	4.09	3.96	1.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.10	4.05	4.07	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.62	4.11	3.93	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GEOG 687 0101  
 Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 834  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.35	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1447/1450	1.92	3.87	4.09	3.96	1.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.10	4.05	4.07	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.98	4.00	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.62	4.11	3.93	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.90	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.90	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.66	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.38	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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