```
Course-Section: GES  102  0201                University of Maryland                                      Page  883
Title        HUMAN GEOGRAPHY                     Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   NEFF, ROBERT                        Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   125
Questionnaires: 86                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                          NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   1   5  18  22  39  4.09 1075/1639  4.12  4.40  4.27 4.08  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   5  11  34  35  4.13  992/1639  4.10  4.03  4.22 4.17  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   3   3   9  26  45  4.24  804/1397  4.13  4.04  4.28 4.18  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  42   3   2   6  12  20  4.02  995/1583  3.91  4.02  4.19 4.01  4.02
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   9   7  12  23  28  3.68 1120/1532  3.82  3.80  4.01 3.88  3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 61  1   0   4   6  13  4.25  612/1504  3.89  3.93  4.05 3.78  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   2  15  15  51  4.35  706/1612  4.39  4.01  4.16 4.10  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   1   1   3   4  76  4.80  811/1635  4.47  4.71  4.65 4.56  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 1  0   3  20  32  18  3.89 1063/1579  4.02  4.00  4.08 3.95  3.89

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   1   2  16  65  4.73  510/1518  4.69  4.45  4.43 4.38  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   3   9  71  4.82  776/1520  4.76  4.71  4.70 4.61  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   2  11  29  42  4.32  811/1517  4.31  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   3   9  17  54  4.47  690/1550  4.42  4.18  4.22 4.17  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1   2   2  13  22  42  4.23  474/1295  4.09  4.25  3.94 3.84  4.23

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0   4   2  11  19  34  4.10  735/1398  4.10  3.94  4.07 3.85  4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0   4   3  10  12  40  4.17  879/1391  4.17  4.21  4.30 4.07  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  1   4   6  15  45  4.39  746/1388  4.39  4.24  4.28 4.01  4.39
4. Were special techniques successful                  18  49   4   1   3   2   9  3.58 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93 3.71  ****

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  83   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.27  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 83 0  1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 83 1  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           82   2   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 83   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.45  4.18 4.25  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 83 1  0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 83 0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 83 1  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  78  ****  4.22  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    80   0   0   0   4   1   1  3.50 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                83   0   0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/  82  ****  4.22  4.16 3.90  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 83   0   2   0   0   1   0  2.00 ****/  52  ****  2.75  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 83   0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/  53  ****  3.25  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       83   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  42  ****  4.88  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   83   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 83   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  32  ****  4.25  4.56 4.60  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 83  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  50  ****  3.58  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    83   0   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  32  ****  4.00  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      83   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  4.92  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       82   0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  32  ****  3.44  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     83   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  21  ****  3.00  4.52 5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 125
Questionnaires: 86   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   11   0.00-0.99   3   A   24   Required for Majors 50   Graduate   0   Major   2
  28-55   9   1.00-1.99   0   B   28
  56-83   4   2.00-2.99   2   C   14   General   4   Under-grad   86   Non-major   84
  84-150   6   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                                 P   0   responses to be significant
                                                 I   0   Other   13
                                                 ?   2

```
Course-Section: GES  102  0301          University of Maryland                         Page  884
Title       HUMAN GEOGRAPHY                 Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J                   Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    113
Questionnaires:  77                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  4 13 23 36  4.16 1003/1639 4.12  4.40  4.27 4.08  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  5 20 17 35  4.06 1044/1639 4.10  4.03  4.22 4.17  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  2  7 11 24 32  4.01  969/1397 4.13  4.04  4.28 4.18  4.01
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  41  2  2 10  9 13  3.81 1226/1583 3.91  4.02  4.19 4.01  3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  0  5 19 24 26  3.96  842/1532 3.82  3.80  4.01 3.88  3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 50  5  2  4  4 11  3.54 1194/1504 3.89  3.93  4.05 3.78  3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  4  7 17 47  4.43  603/1612 4.39  4.01  4.16 4.10  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  1  3 56 15  4.13 1434/1635 4.47  4.71  4.65 4.56  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0  0 14 34 25  4.15  772/1579 4.02  4.00  4.08 3.95  4.15

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  2  1 19 54  4.64  629/1518 4.69  4.45  4.43 4.38  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  3  2  9 62  4.71  961/1520 4.76  4.71  4.70 4.61  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  2  8 24 40  4.29  854/1517 4.31  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  4  6 20 45  4.37  805/1550 4.42  4.18  4.22 4.17  4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  6  2 13 23 31  3.95  687/1295 4.09  4.25  3.94 3.84  3.95

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 71 0  0  0  2  3  1  3.83 ****/1398 4.10  3.94  4.07 3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 71 0  1  0  3  2  0  3.00 ****/1391 4.17  4.21  4.30 4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 66 0  1  1  3  5  1  3.36 ****/1388 4.39  4.24  4.28 4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  71   3  1  0  2  0  0  2.33 ****/ 958 ****  3.55  3.93 3.71  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  75   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224 ****  4.27  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 75 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 240 ****  4.39  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 76 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219 ****  4.59  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           75   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 215 ****  4.45  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 76   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198 ****  4.45  4.18 4.25  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     13      0.00-0.99   4       A   15      Required for Majors  43    Graduate      0     Major        2
  28-55      7      1.00-1.99   0       B   28
  56-83      5      2.00-2.99   3       C   17      General               9    Under-grad   77     Non-major   75
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49   5       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4       F    0      Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                10
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  105  0101                  University of Maryland                                      Page  885
Title        WORLD REGIONAL GEOG                   Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  STEELE, CHRISTO                       Fall   2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      79
Questionnaires:  49                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  0  6 20 21  4.25  890/1639   4.25  4.40   4.27 4.08  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  2  8 21 18  4.12  992/1639   4.12  4.03   4.22 4.17  4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  4  6 13 26  4.24  804/1397   4.24  4.04   4.28 4.18  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  1  2  2  8 21 14  3.91 1143/1583   3.91  4.02   4.19 4.01  3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0  1  5 12 19  9  3.65 1144/1532   3.65  3.80   4.01 3.88  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 6  6 20 12  3.74 1067/1504   3.74  3.93   4.05 3.78  3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3  0  0  3  6 16 21  4.20  882/1612   4.20  4.01   4.16 4.10  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  0  0  0 33 13  4.28 1326/1635   4.28  4.71   4.65 4.56  4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 2 2 2 6 15 10  3.83 1117/1579   3.83  4.00   4.08 3.95  3.83

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  2  6  4 22 12  3.78 1357/1518   3.78  4.45   4.43 4.38  3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  1  1  4  5 36  4.57 1136/1520   4.57  4.71   4.70 4.61  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0  1  4  7 18 15  3.93 1152/1517   3.93  4.14   4.27 4.20  3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  1  3  4 18 21  4.17  963/1550   4.17  4.18   4.22 4.17  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0  1  6 15 24  4.35  391/1295   4.35  4.25   3.94 3.84  4.35

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0  0  2  7 14 18  4.17  688/1398   4.17  3.94   4.07 3.85  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  1  2 10  7 21  4.10  940/1391   4.10  4.21   4.30 4.07  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0  1  5 15 20  4.32  795/1388   4.32  4.24   4.28 4.01  4.32
4. Were special techniques successful                  9 23  6  1  6  4  0  2.47  920/ 958   2.47  3.55   3.93 3.71  2.47

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 48 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 240   ****  4.39   4.11 4.01  ****

                 Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   47  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80   ****  3.33   4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               47  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82   ****  4.22   4.16 3.90  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52   ****  2.75   4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 48 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53   ****  3.25   4.05 3.51  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  50   ****  3.58   4.45 4.54  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      47  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32   ****  3.44   4.37 4.67  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      5        0.00-0.99   1       A   18        Required for Majors  23    Graduate    0        Major       0
  28-55      2        1.00-1.99   0       B    9
  56-83      6        2.00-2.99   5       C    6        General              12    Under-grad 49        Non-major  49
  84-150     5        3.00-3.49   1       D    1
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   3       F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    1                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    1        Other                 1
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES 110  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  886
Title        PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY              Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    LEWIS, LAURAJEA               Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      75
Questionnaires: 33                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
       ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0  10   9  14  4.12 1042/1639  4.25  4.40  4.27 4.08  4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   3   4  10  16  4.18  926/1639  4.29  4.03  4.22 4.17  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   3   7  21  4.39  669/1397  4.37  4.04  4.28 4.18  4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6   1   2   7   6  11  3.89 1171/1583  3.95  4.02  4.19 4.01  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   1   1   5   7  15  4.17  648/1532  4.10  3.80  4.01 3.88  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0   5   4   5   9  3.78 1026/1504  3.78  3.93  4.05 3.78  3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   8  23  4.64  352/1612  4.58  4.01  4.16 4.10  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   4  28  4.88  706/1635  4.90  4.71  4.65 4.56  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0   1   8  16   3  3.75 1170/1579  4.03  4.00  4.08 3.95  3.75


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   2   7  23  4.66  616/1518  4.77  4.45  4.43 4.38  4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   3   3  26  4.64 1074/1520  4.81  4.71  4.70 4.61  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   6   8  19  4.39  736/1517  4.51  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1   1   0   5  12  14  4.19  953/1550  4.44  4.18  4.22 4.17  4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   4   9  20  4.48  281/1295  4.56  4.25  3.94 3.84  4.48


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  1   1   4  11   5  3.82  924/1398  3.83  3.94  4.07 3.85  3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  1   0   2   4  16  4.48  639/1391  4.29  4.21  4.30 4.07  4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1   0   6   5  10  4.05  933/1388  3.91  4.24  4.28 4.01  4.05
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  14  0   1   2   1   5  4.11  430/ 958  4.11  3.55  3.93 3.71  4.11


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           30  0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.45  4.18 4.25  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.22  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    31  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.22  4.16 3.90  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  2.75  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.25  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  4.88  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.25  4.56 4.60  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  3.58  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.00  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  4.92  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.44  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  3.00  4.52 5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: GES  110  0101            University of Maryland
Title           PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY         Baltimore County
Instructor:     LEWIS, LAURAJEA            Fall   2007
Enrollment:      75
Questionnaires:  33              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: GES  110  0201            University of Maryland                              Page  887
Title      PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY                 Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  RABENHORST, THO                  Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    81
Questionnaires:  43                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  4  9  29  4.53  582/1639  4.25  4.40  4.27  4.08  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  2 10  29  4.53  486/1639  4.29  4.03  4.22  4.17  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  2 11  28  4.51  507/1397  4.37  4.04  4.28  4.18  4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  32  0  0  3  4   4  4.09  946/1583  3.95  4.02  4.19  4.01  4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  2  1 10  8  17  3.97  815/1532  4.10  3.80  4.01  3.88  3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 35  0  1  2  2  3  3.88 ****/1504  3.78  3.93  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  8  33  4.72  249/1612  4.58  4.01  4.16  4.10  4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  2  40  4.91  662/1635  4.90  4.71  4.65  4.56  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0  0  1 20  14  4.37  527/1579  4.03  4.00  4.08  3.95  4.37

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  1  40  4.93  170/1518  4.77  4.45  4.43  4.38  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  2  39  4.90  546/1520  4.81  4.71  4.70  4.61  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  6  33  4.71  347/1517  4.51  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  0  1  1  4  36  4.79  313/1550  4.44  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  1  8  31  4.75  135/1295  4.56  4.25  3.94  3.84  4.75

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  1  2  0  5  4.13 ****/1398  3.83  3.94  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0  0  2  0  0  6  4.25 ****/1391  4.29  4.21  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 31 0 0  2  3  3  4  3.75 1095/1388  3.91  4.24  4.28  4.01  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  35   4  0  1  0  0  3  4.25 ****/ 958  4.11  3.55  3.93  3.71  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  42   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.27  4.10  3.90  ****

                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      8      0.00-0.99   1        A  19       Required for Majors  20    Graduate      0      Major        1
 28-55      7      1.00-1.99   1        B  18
 56-83      8      2.00-2.99   6        C   3       General               4    Under-grad   43      Non-major   42
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49   4        D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   5        F   0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                15
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  110  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page  888
Title       PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY               Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HALVERSON, JEFF                    Fall   2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     83
Questionnaires: 60                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   3   4   8  14  31  4.10 1068/1639  4.25  4.40  4.27 4.08  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   5   8  16  30  4.15  959/1639  4.29  4.03  4.22 4.17  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   4   4  23  28  4.22  831/1397  4.37  4.04  4.28 4.18  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  33   1   3   5   6  11  3.88 1171/1583  3.95  4.02  4.19 4.01  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   1   5   8  14  30  4.16  663/1532  4.10  3.80  4.01 3.88  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 46  3   0   1   3   7  3.79 ****/1504  3.78  3.93  4.05 3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1   0   2   8  15  34  4.37  669/1612  4.58  4.01  4.16 4.10  4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   5  55  4.92  595/1635  4.90  4.71  4.65 4.56  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12  2   0   3   6  27  10  3.96  972/1579  4.03  4.00  4.08 3.95  3.96


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   1   2   9  45  4.72  529/1518  4.77  4.45  4.43 4.38  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   1   1   1  54  4.89  571/1520  4.81  4.71  4.70 4.61  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   1   6  18  32  4.42  700/1517  4.51  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   2   2   6  12  35  4.33  832/1550  4.44  4.18  4.22 4.17  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2   0   1   7  13  34  4.45  305/1295  4.56  4.25  3.94 3.84  4.45


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29  0   0   3   9   9  10  3.84  916/1398  3.83  3.94  4.07 3.85  3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 29  0   1   0   8   8  14  4.10  940/1391  4.29  4.21  4.30 4.07  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 29 0   2   0   8   9  12  3.94 1007/1388  3.91  4.24  4.28 4.01  3.94
4. Were special techniques successful                   29 26   0   2   1   0   2  3.40 ****/ 958  4.11  3.55  3.93 3.71  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   53  6   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.27  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11 4.01  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 53  6   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58 4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     56  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 56  3   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  82  ****  4.22  4.16 3.90  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  58  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/  52  ****  2.75  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  58  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  3.25  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        56  1   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  42  ****  4.88  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    57  1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  57  2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  4.25  4.56 4.60  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 56  0   2   0   0   0   2  3.00 ****/  50  ****  3.58  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     56  1   0   2   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  32  ****  4.00  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       56  1   0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/  43  ****  4.92  4.69 4.69  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4        0.00-0.99   0       A   13         Required for Majors  32      Graduate      0        Major        3
  28-55      6        1.00-1.99   0       B   27
  56-83      5        2.00-2.99   5       C   11         General               8      Under-grad   60        Non-major   57
  84-150     8        3.00-3.49   8       D    1
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   7       F    0         Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                              responses to be significant
I    0              Other              9
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  120  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  889
Title       ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI          Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  ELLIS, ERLE                       Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   125
Questionnaires:  54                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  1  7 10 36  4.50  615/1639  4.50  4.40  4.27 4.08  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  2  4 16 32  4.44  617/1639  4.44  4.03  4.22 4.17  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  5  6 18 24  4.09  938/1397  4.09  4.04  4.28 4.18  4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  10  0  4  4 19 17  4.11  929/1583  4.11  4.02  4.19 4.01  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1  2  1  8 18 23  4.13  677/1532  4.13  3.80  4.01 3.88  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17 1  2 11 12 11 3.81 1003/1504  3.81  3.93  4.05 3.78  3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  1  2  9 14 27  4.21  872/1612  4.21  4.01  4.16 4.10  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  1  7 44  4.83  781/1635  4.83  4.71  4.65 4.56  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 1  1  6 26 10 3.98 939/1579  3.98  4.00  4.08 3.95  3.98


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  1 15 36  4.67  588/1518  4.67  4.45  4.43 4.38  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  0  0  1  3 47  4.90  546/1520  4.90  4.71  4.70 4.61  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0  3  2 13 33  4.49  609/1517  4.49  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  3  3 12 34  4.48  664/1550  4.48  4.18  4.22 4.17  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0  1  2 11 34  4.63  209/1295  4.63  4.25  3.94 3.84  4.63


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26 0 2  0 12  5  9  3.68 1023/1398  3.68  3.94  4.07 3.85  3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 0  5  8  3 12  3.79 1132/1391  3.79  4.21  4.30 4.07  3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 1 3  2  7 17  4.20  872/1388  4.20  4.24  4.28 4.01  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                 25  12  3  2  4  1  7  3.41  764/ 958  3.41  3.55  3.93 3.71  3.41


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 52  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.27  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 52 1 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          52  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 52 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.45  4.18 4.25  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.22  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.22  4.16 3.90  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  2.75  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.25  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  4.88  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.25  4.56 4.60  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 53 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  3.58  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.00  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  4.92  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.44  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    53  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  3.00  4.52 5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: GES  120  0101                  University of Maryland                           Page  889
Title           ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI          Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     ELLIS, ERLE                     Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     125
Questionnaires:  54                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA            Expected Grades             Reasons                    Type                        Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    11          0.00-0.99    1        A    12          Required for Majors  23      Graduate      0         Major         2
  28-55     5          1.00-1.99    0        B    24
  56-83     2          2.00-2.99    2        C     5          General               5      Under-grad   54         Non-major    52
  84-150    5          3.00-3.49    6        D     2
  Grad.     0          3.50-4.00    5        F     1          Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P     0                                       responses to be significant
                                             I     0          Other                16
                                             ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  220  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  890
Title           ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE         Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     READEL, KARIN                  Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      13
Questionnaires:   8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  318/1639  4.75  4.40  4.27  4.35  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  252/1639  4.75  4.03  4.22  4.27  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.04  4.28  4.39  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  281/1583  4.71  4.02  4.19  4.28  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  1  1  0  4  3.71 1092/1532  3.71  3.80  4.01  4.09  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  1  5  4.25  612/1504  4.25  3.93  4.05  4.09  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  2  2  3  3.88 1198/1612  3.88  4.01  4.16  4.21  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25 1350/1635  4.25  4.71  4.65  4.63  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  473/1579  4.43  4.00  4.08  4.14  4.43


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  529/1518  4.71  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  674/1520  4.86  4.71  4.70  4.78  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  510/1517  4.57  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  401/1550  4.71  4.18  4.22  4.33  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  185/1295  4.67  4.25  3.94  4.07  4.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  200/1398  4.83  3.94  4.07  4.14  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  300/1391  4.83  4.21  4.30  4.35  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.24  4.28  4.37  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   2  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  119/ 958  4.75  3.55  3.93  4.00  4.75


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   24/ 224  4.83  4.27  4.10  4.33  4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   29/ 240  4.83  4.39  4.11  4.47  4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   46/ 219  4.83  4.59  4.44  4.61  4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   45/ 215  4.83  4.45  4.35  4.43  4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2   0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67   38/ 198  4.67  4.45  4.18  4.08  4.67


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  2.75  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  3.25  4.05  4.28  ****

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

```
Course-Section: GES  280  0101              University of Maryland                                   Page  891
Title      MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI           Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SCHOOL, JOSEPH  (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  4  11  4.73   342/1639   4.73  4.40  4.27  4.35  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  8   7  4.47   583/1639   4.47  4.03  4.22  4.27  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  3  6   6  4.20   850/1397   4.20  4.04  4.28  4.39  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  1  6   7  4.43   572/1583   4.43  4.02  4.19  4.28  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  3  2  0  2  4  4  3.67  1136/1532  3.67  3.80  4.01  4.09  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  2  0  4  2  2  5  3.62  1147/1504  3.62  3.93  4.05  4.09  3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53   459/1612   4.53  4.01  4.16  4.21  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80   811/1635   4.80  4.71  4.65  4.63  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  0  7  7  4.50  382/1579  4.42  4.00  4.08  4.14  4.42

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  5  10  4.67   602/1518   4.53  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00     1/1520   5.00  4.71  4.70  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53  560/1517  4.37  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  1  2  11  4.53   603/1550   4.77  4.18  4.22  4.33  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86   95/1295  4.73  4.25  3.94  4.07  4.73

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8  0  0  0  3  1  3  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07  4.14  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8  0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  793/1391  4.29  4.21  4.30  4.35  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7  0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  647/1388  4.50  4.24  4.28  4.37  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 8  5  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93  4.00  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 224   5.00  4.27  4.10  4.33  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  10  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  32/ 240  4.80  4.39  4.11  4.47  4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  10  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00   1/ 219  5.00  4.59  4.44  4.61  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          10  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80    51/ 215  4.80  4.45  4.35  4.43  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  10  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   75/ 198  4.40  4.45  4.18  4.08  4.40

                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0       A   1     Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major      15
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0       B  10
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99   1       C   4     General               0    Under-grad   15      Non-major   0
 84-150    0      3.00-3.49   0       D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   2       F   0     Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                               responses to be significant
                                      I   0     Other                15
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  280  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  892
Title       MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI               Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SCHOOL, JOSEPH  (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires:  15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  342/1639  4.73  4.40  4.27 4.35  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0  0  0  0  0  8  7  4.47  583/1639  4.47  4.03  4.22 4.27  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  3  6  6  4.20  850/1397  4.20  4.04  4.28 4.39  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0  1  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  572/1583  4.43  4.02  4.19 4.28  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  3  2  0  2  4  4  3.67 1136/1532  3.67  3.80  4.01 4.09  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  4  2  2  5  3.62 1147/1504  3.62  3.93  4.05 4.09  3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  459/1612  4.53  4.01  4.16 4.21  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  811/1635  4.80  4.71  4.65 4.63  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  569/1579  4.42  4.00  4.08 4.14  4.42

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         10  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  947/1518  4.53  4.45  4.43 4.48  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    10  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.71  4.70 4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  947/1517  4.37  4.14  4.27 4.34  4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       9  1  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1550  4.77  4.18  4.22 4.33  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  221/1295  4.73  4.25  3.94 4.07  4.73

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8  0  0  0  3  1  3  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07 4.14  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8  0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  793/1391  4.29  4.21  4.30 4.35  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  647/1388  4.50  4.24  4.28 4.37  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                    8  5  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93 4.00  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   10  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 224  5.00  4.27  4.10 4.33  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   32/ 240  4.80  4.39  4.11 4.47  4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 219  5.00  4.59  4.44 4.61  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            10  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   51/ 215  4.80  4.45  4.35 4.43  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  10  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   75/ 198  4.40  4.45  4.18 4.08  4.40

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   1      Required for Majors   1    Graduate     0     Major      15
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B  10
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    1      C   4      General               0    Under-grad  15     Non-major   0
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0      D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2      F   0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                15
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  305  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  893
Title       LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY                  Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    ELLIS, ERLE                       Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  469/1639  4.64  4.40  4.27  4.28  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  2  5  3  3.82 1319/1639  3.82  4.03  4.22  4.20  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  1  4  4  4.10  935/1397  4.10  4.04  4.28  4.26  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  5  3  3.91 1158/1583  3.91  4.02  4.19  4.24  3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  6  4  4.18  640/1532  4.18  3.80  4.01  4.05  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  3  2  5  4.20  667/1504  4.20  3.93  4.05  4.12  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  449/1612  4.55  4.01  4.16  4.12  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.71  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0  0  1  6  3  4.20  725/1579  4.20  4.00  4.08  4.07  4.20


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  213/1518  4.91  4.45  4.43  4.39  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.71  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  547/1517  4.55  4.14  4.27  4.23  4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  591/1550  4.55  4.18  4.22  4.20  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  1  0  0  4  5  4.20  505/1295  4.20  4.25  3.94  3.95  4.20


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07  4.13  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.21  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  571/1388  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.34  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  1  0  0  2  1  1  3.75  610/ 958  3.75  3.55  3.93  3.97  3.75

            Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47  4.65  ****


            Field Work
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58  4.52  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: GES 308  0101                University of Maryland                          Page  894
Title      ECOLOGY                             Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SWAN, CHRIS                          Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     47
Questionnaires:  30                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   0   0   3   5  20  4.61   508/1639  4.61  4.40  4.27  4.28  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   0   4   8  16  4.43   650/1639  4.43  4.03  4.22  4.20  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   2   3   8  15  4.29   767/1397  4.29  4.04  4.28  4.26  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   6   1   3   1   5  12  4.09   946/1583  4.09  4.02  4.19  4.24  4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1   7   2   9   3   6  2.96  1437/1532  2.96  3.80  4.01  4.05  2.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4  1   2   6   6   9  3.83   990/1504  3.83  3.93  4.05  4.12  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   0   2   8  18  4.57   418/1612  4.57  4.01  4.16  4.12  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0  20   8  4.29  1326/1635  4.29  4.71  4.65  4.66  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  2   1   2   9  10  4.00   889/1579  4.00  4.00  4.08  4.07  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   4  23  4.79   397/1518  4.79  4.45  4.43  4.39  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   2  25  4.86   674/1520  4.86  4.71  4.70  4.68  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   2   3   7  16  4.32   811/1517  4.32  4.14  4.27  4.23  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   0   8  20  4.71   401/1550  4.71  4.18  4.22  4.20  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0  0   0   2   6  19  4.63   209/1295  4.63  4.25  3.94  3.95  4.63


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  0   2   5   3   2  3.42  1156/1398  3.42  3.94  4.07  4.13  3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0  2   2   4   1   3  3.08  1310/1391  3.08  4.21  4.30  4.35  3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 3  0   1   4   4  3.50  1185/1388  3.50  4.24  4.28  4.34  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  19   5   1   1   3   1   0  2.67 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93  3.97  ****


            Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44  4.44  ****


            Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    29   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47  4.65  ****


            Field Work
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   29   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58  4.52  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    2        0.00-0.99   0      A    9       Required for Majors  2     Graduate     0       Major      1
 28-55    2        1.00-1.99   1      B   10
 56-83    7        2.00-2.99   5      C    6       General          1        Under-grad  30       Non-major  29
 84-150   7        3.00-3.49   5      D    0
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   9      F    0       Electives        2        #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other           21
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  311  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  895
Title       WEATHER AND CLIMATE                 Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  TOKAY, ALI                           Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  29                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  6  5 18  4.41  740/1639  4.41  4.40  4.27  4.28  4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  1  3  7 17  4.31  800/1639  4.31  4.03  4.22  4.20  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  2  4  7 15  4.14  906/1397  4.14  4.04  4.28  4.26  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  6  0  1  2  7 13  4.39  611/1583  4.39  4.02  4.19  4.24  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 14  1  2  2  4  5  3.71 1092/1532  3.71  3.80  4.01  4.05  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  0  0  5  3 10  4.28  594/1504  4.28  3.93  4.05  4.12  4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  1  0  7 19  4.50  490/1612  4.50  4.01  4.16  4.12  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0 18 10  4.36 1273/1635  4.36  4.71  4.65  4.66  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  1  4 13  6  4.00  889/1579  4.00  4.00  4.08  4.07  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  1  3 23  4.81  345/1518  4.81  4.45  4.43  4.39  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1 26  4.96  219/1520  4.96  4.71  4.70  4.68  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  2  7 17  4.48  622/1517  4.48  4.14  4.27  4.23  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  1  0  3  5 18  4.44  716/1550  4.44  4.18  4.22  4.20  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3  0  0  5  5 14  4.38  368/1295  4.38  4.25  3.94  3.95  4.38

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0  2  0  4  1  5  3.58 1080/1398  3.58  3.94  4.07  4.13  3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0  0  0  2  4  6  4.33  752/1391  4.33  4.21  4.30  4.35  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0  1  0  1  5  6  4.15  892/1388  4.15  4.24  4.28  4.34  4.15
4. Were special techniques successful                  16 10  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93  3.97  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.27  4.10  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35  4.21  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.45  4.18  4.04  ****

            Field Work
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  3.88  4.58  4.52  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0        A    7       Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0       Major       5
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0        B   10
  56-83     4      2.00-2.99    4        C    8       General              8      Under-grad   29       Non-major  24
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49    5        D    1
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    5        F    0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               14
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  313  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page  896
Title       BIOGEOGRAPHY                            Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    LEWIS, LAURA                          Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires:  34                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2  15  10   7  3.65 1428/1639  3.65  4.40  4.27  4.28  3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   8   9  15  4.09 1029/1639  4.09  4.03  4.22  4.20  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3  10  20  4.44  603/1397  4.44  4.04  4.28  4.26  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   1   2   6  14   8  3.84 1205/1583  3.84  4.02  4.19  4.24  3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   4   4   6  11   8  3.45 1270/1532  3.45  3.80  4.01  4.05  3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   5  10  10   9  3.68 1110/1504  3.68  3.93  4.05  4.12  3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   4   7  21  4.38  656/1612  4.38  4.01  4.16  4.12  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   6  27  4.76  869/1635  4.76  4.71  4.65  4.66  4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1   0  12  12   5  3.67 1232/1579  3.67  4.00  4.08  4.07  3.67

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   4   3  13  12  4.03 1226/1518  4.03  4.45  4.43  4.39  4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   3   6  22  4.61 1101/1520  4.61  4.71  4.70  4.68  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   7  15   9  4.06 1048/1517  4.06  4.14  4.27  4.23  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   1   3   7  12   8  3.74 1241/1550  3.74  4.18  4.22  4.20  3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  2   2   4  11  11  3.90  731/1295  3.90  4.25  3.94  3.95  3.90

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  1   1   6   1   3  3.33 1183/1398  3.33  3.94  4.07  4.13  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  0   1   1   3   7  4.33  752/1391  4.33  4.21  4.30  4.35  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 0   1   2   2   8  4.31  802/1388  4.31  4.24  4.28  4.34  4.31
4. Were special techniques successful                  20   1   2   4   5   0   2  2.69  902/ 958  2.69  3.55  3.93  3.97  2.69

                 Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           33   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35  4.21  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0       A   14        Required for Majors   2        Graduate      0        Major        10
  28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0       B   16
  56-83      8         2.00-2.99    6       C    3        General               9        Under-grad   34        Non-major    24
  84-150    11         3.00-3.49    5       D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    8       F    0        Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                22
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  326  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  897
Title        CONSERVATION THOUGHT            Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PARKER, EUGENE                  Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires: 30                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
        ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  2  2  4 21  4.52  604/1639  4.52  4.40  4.27 4.28  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  2  6  6 15  4.17  937/1639  4.17  4.03  4.22 4.20  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  1  4  7 17  4.38  687/1397  4.38  4.04  4.28 4.26  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  1  3  9 16  4.38  640/1583  4.38  4.02  4.19 4.24  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  3  6 19  4.48  356/1532  4.48  3.80  4.01 4.05  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  1  5  4 19  4.41  478/1504  4.41  3.93  4.05 4.12  4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  1  2  4  5 17  4.21  872/1612  4.21  4.01  4.16 4.12  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  1  0  0  0  7 21  4.75  884/1635  4.75  4.71  4.65 4.66  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0  0  2  6 16  4.58  302/1579  4.58  4.00  4.08 4.07  4.58


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  5  7 17  4.41  933/1518  4.41  4.45  4.43 4.39  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  2 27  4.93  382/1520  4.93  4.71  4.70 4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  5  2  8 13  4.04 1065/1517  4.04  4.14  4.27 4.23  4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  1  1  0  1  5 21  4.61  522/1550  4.61  4.18  4.22 4.20  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1  0  6  9  8  3.96  677/1295  3.96  4.25  3.94 3.95  3.96


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1  0  3  8  6  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07 4.13  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1  0  1  7  8  4.24  831/1391  4.24  4.21  4.30 4.35  4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 1  1  0  1 14  4.53  631/1388  4.53  4.24  4.28 4.34  4.53
4. Were special techniques successful                   13 0 1  1  6  2  7  3.76  603/ 958  3.76  3.55  3.93 3.97  3.76


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11 4.08  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            28 1 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35 4.21  ****


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52 4.59  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  29 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  2.75  4.04 4.78  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0         0.00-0.99   0      A     3        Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0       Major       7
 28-55      0         1.00-1.99   0      B    17
 56-83      3         2.00-2.99   2      C     9        General              9     Under-grad   30       Non-major  23
 84-150     8         3.00-3.49   6      D     0
 Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   5      F     0        Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P     0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I     0        Other               16
                                        ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: GES  330  0101              University of Maryland                                  Page  898
Title      GEOG OF ECON DEVELOPME            Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BENNETT, SARI J                    Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     37
Questionnaires:  26                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  2  6 16  4.48  642/1639  4.48  4.40  4.27 4.28  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  4 11  9  4.12  992/1639  4.12  4.03  4.22 4.20  4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  2  6  7 10  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.04  4.28 4.26  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  21  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/1583  ****  4.02  4.19 4.24  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  0  6  5 12  4.13  685/1532  4.13  3.80  4.01 4.05  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 22  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1504  ****  3.93  4.05 4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  3  3  4 15  4.24  837/1612  4.24  4.01  4.16 4.12  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  3 16  5  4.08 1462/1635  4.08  4.71  4.65 4.66  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  2 13  8  4.26  646/1579  4.26  4.00  4.08 4.07  4.26


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  1 22  4.88  257/1518  4.88  4.45  4.43 4.39  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  622/1520  4.88  4.71  4.70 4.68  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  3  1  6 13  4.26  875/1517  4.26  4.14  4.27 4.23  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  2  1  3 18  4.54  591/1550  4.54  4.18  4.22 4.20  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  2  7 15  4.54  247/1295  4.54  4.25  3.94 3.95  4.54


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  6  4  5  3.93  851/1398  3.93  3.94  4.07 4.13  3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  3  5  7  4.27  808/1391  4.27  4.21  4.30 4.35  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  783/1388  4.33  4.24  4.28 4.34  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   11 14  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93 3.97  ****

             Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44 4.44  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0       A   2        Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0        Major        2
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B   9
 56-83     4        2.00-2.99   3       C   9        General              6      Under-grad  26        Non-major   24
 84-150    3        3.00-3.49   5       D   1
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   3       F   0        Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               15
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  381  0101             University of Maryland                              Page  899
Title          REMOTE SENSING                  Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    RABENHORST, THO                 Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       16
Questionnaires:   14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  281/1639  4.79  4.40  4.27  4.28  4.79
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  8  5  4.29  831/1639  4.29  4.03  4.22  4.20  4.29
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21  831/1397  4.21  4.04  4.28  4.26  4.21
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  669/1583  4.36  4.02  4.19  4.24  4.36
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  2  1  0  3  3  3.44 1276/1532  3.44  3.80  4.01  4.05  3.44
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  367/1504  4.50  3.93  4.05  4.12  4.50
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  603/1612  4.43  4.01  4.16  4.12  4.43
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  529/1635  4.93  4.71  4.65  4.66  4.93
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  352/1579  4.54  4.00  4.08  4.07  4.54


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1518  5.00  4.45  4.43  4.39  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  674/1520  4.86  4.71  4.70  4.68  4.86
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43  700/1517  4.43  4.14  4.27  4.23  4.43
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  231/1550  4.86  4.18  4.22  4.20  4.86
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86   95/1295  4.86  4.25  3.94  3.95  4.86


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  426/1398  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.13  4.50
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  816/1391  4.25  4.21  4.30  4.35  4.25
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  647/1388  4.50  4.24  4.28  4.34  4.50
 4. Were special techniques successful                  10  1  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93  3.97  ****


             Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   27/ 224  4.80  4.27  4.10  4.06  4.80
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   68/ 240  4.60  4.39  4.11  4.08  4.60
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  0  0  1  0  0  4  4.40  138/ 219  4.40  4.59  4.44  4.44  4.40
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            9  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   83/ 215  4.60  4.45  4.35  4.21  4.60
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   9  0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  108/ 198  4.20  4.45  4.18  4.04  4.20

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  386  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  900
Title      INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM              Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   TANG, JUNMEI                     Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0   0   1   5   2   8  4.06 1096/1639  4.06  4.40  4.27  4.28  4.06
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   1   3   7   3   2  3.13 1572/1639  3.13  4.03  4.22  4.20  3.13
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   3   2   5   4   2  3.00 1363/1397  3.00  4.04  4.28  4.26  3.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   1   1   1   6   5   2  3.40 1449/1583  3.40  4.02  4.19  4.24  3.40
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   1   1   1   2   4   6  3.93  883/1532  3.93  3.80  4.01  4.05  3.93
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2   1   0   3   7   2  3.69 1098/1504  3.69  3.93  4.05  4.12  3.69
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained              2   0   1   2   3   4   4  3.57 1371/1612  3.57  4.01  4.16  4.12  3.57
 8. How many times was class cancelled                    1   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.71  4.65  4.66  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  2   1   2   8   1   0  2.75 1531/1579  2.75  4.00  4.08  4.07  2.75


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          1   0   0   2   3   4   6  3.93 1293/1518  3.93  4.45  4.43  4.39  3.93
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1   0   0   0   3   4   8  4.33 1318/1520  4.33  4.71  4.70  4.68  4.33
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   1   5   4   3   2  3.00 1453/1517  3.00  4.14  4.27  4.23  3.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       1   0   2   3   6   2   2  2.93 1456/1550  2.93  4.18  4.22  4.20  2.93
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   0   2   1   4   5   3  3.40 1035/1295  3.40  4.25  3.94  3.95  3.40


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  10  0   2   1   2   1   0  2.33 1373/1398  2.33  3.94  4.07  4.13  2.33
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10  0   3   0   3   0   0  2.00 1385/1391  2.00  4.21  4.30  4.35  2.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0   3   2   1   0   0  1.67 1387/1388  1.67  4.24  4.28  4.34  1.67


              Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    3   0   1   0   3   2   7  4.08  120/ 224  4.08  4.27  4.10  4.06  4.08
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3   0   1   1   3   3   5  3.77  186/ 240  3.77  4.39  4.11  4.08  3.77
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3   0   1   0   1   2   9  4.38  141/ 219  4.38  4.59  4.44  4.44  4.38
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             3   0   0   1   3   4   5  4.00  158/ 215  4.00  4.45  4.35  4.21  4.00
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   3   0   3   0   1   4   5  3.62  167/ 198  3.62  4.45  4.18  4.04  3.62


              Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58  4.50  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52  4.59  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  4.22  4.47  4.60  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      15  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47  4.65  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  15  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  82  ****  4.22  4.16  4.08  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0       A    4      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0     Major         8
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B    8
 56-83     2        2.00-2.99   2       C    2      General              3     Under-grad  16     Non-major     8
 84-150    4        3.00-3.49   1       D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   3       F    0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               11
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: GES  400A 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  901
Title      POPULATION GEOGRAPHY           Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   RATCLIFFE, MICH             Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  684/1639  4.45  4.40  4.27  4.42  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  4  5  4.18  926/1639  4.18  4.03  4.22  4.29  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.04  4.28  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  536/1583  4.45  4.02  4.19  4.31  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  2  4  4  4.00  774/1532  4.00  3.80  4.01  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  594/1504  4.27  3.93  4.05  4.20  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  352/1612  4.64  4.01  4.16  4.18  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  662/1635  4.90  4.71  4.65  4.72  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  159/1579  4.78  4.00  4.08  4.21  4.78

         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  745/1518  4.56  4.45  4.43  4.51  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  855/1520  4.78  4.71  4.70  4.75  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  535/1517  4.56  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  457/1550  4.67  4.18  4.22  4.24  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  185/1295  4.67  4.25  3.94  4.01  4.67

         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1398  4.80  3.94  4.07  4.23  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  332/1391  4.80  4.21  4.30  4.48  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  328/1388  4.80  4.24  4.28  4.50  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   4  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.55  3.93  4.24  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  406  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  902
Title        AQUATIC ECOLOGY                    Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SWAN, CHRIS    (Instr. A)          Fall  2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires: 11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  469/1639  4.64  4.40  4.27  4.42  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  284/1639  4.73  4.03  4.22  4.29  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  223/1397  4.82  4.04  4.28  4.38  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  536/1583  4.45  4.02  4.19  4.31  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  4  4  3  3.91  911/1532  3.91  3.80  4.01  4.07  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   2  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  441/1504  4.44  3.93  4.05  4.20  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  249/1612  4.73  4.01  4.16  4.18  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64 1034/1635  4.64  4.71  4.65  4.72  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0  2  0  0  2  6  4.00  889/1579  4.00  4.00  4.08  4.21  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  360/1518  4.80  4.45  4.43  4.51  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.71  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  239/1517  4.80  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  288/1550  4.80  4.18  4.22  4.24  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   2  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  265/1295  4.50  4.25  3.94  4.01  4.50

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  625/1398  4.25  3.94  4.07  4.23  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  816/1391  4.25  4.21  4.30  4.48  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6   0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.24  4.28  4.50  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 7   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  456/ 958  4.00  3.55  3.93  4.24  4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   37/ 224  4.71  4.27  4.10  4.49  4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  4   0  0  1  0  4  2  4.00  148/ 240  4.00  4.39  4.11  4.26  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   43/ 219  4.86  4.59  4.44  4.42  4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          5   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   45/ 215  4.83  4.45  4.35  4.28  4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   30/ 198  4.71  4.45  4.18  4.21  4.71

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   28/  52  4.50  2.75  4.04  4.84  4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   18/  53  4.50  3.25  4.05  4.58  4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      7   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   26/  42  4.75  4.88  4.75  4.71  4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  7   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   20/  37  4.75  3.88  4.58  4.73  4.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25   24/  32  4.25  4.25  4.56  4.64  4.25

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A   1        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major        1
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B   7
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99    3       C   1        General              1     Under-grad   11      Non-major   10
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49    0       D   0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1       F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                9
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  406  0101                 University of Maryland                                    Page  903
Title       AQUATIC ECOLOGY                     Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS     (Instr. B)          Fall  2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  4  7 4.64  469/1639 4.64   4.40  4.27  4.42  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  8 4.73  284/1639 4.73   4.03  4.22  4.29  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  9 4.82  223/1397 4.82   4.04  4.28  4.38  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  4  6 4.45  536/1583 4.45   4.02  4.19  4.31  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  4  4  3 3.91  911/1532 3.91   3.80  4.01  4.07  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0  0  0  5  4 4.44  441/1504 4.44   3.93  4.05  4.20  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  9 4.73  249/1612 4.73   4.01  4.16  4.18  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4  7 4.64 1034/1635 4.64   4.71  4.65  4.72  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 1  0  0  0  3 4.00  889/1579 4.00   4.00  4.08  4.21  4.00

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00  ****/1518 4.80   4.45  4.43  4.51  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00  ****/1520 5.00   4.71  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00  ****/1517 4.80   4.14  4.27  4.34  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   1  0  0  0  0  2 5.00  ****/1550 4.80   4.18  4.22  4.24  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0  0  0  0  2 5.00  ****/1295 4.50   4.25  3.94  4.01  4.50

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  3  1 4.25  625/1398 4.25   3.94  4.07  4.23  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  816/1391 4.25   4.21  4.30  4.48  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  1  3  1 4.00  944/1388 4.00   4.24  4.28  4.50  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   0  0  0  1  2  1 4.00  456/ 958 4.00   3.55  3.93  4.24  4.00

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4   0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71   37/ 224 4.71   4.27  4.10  4.49  4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0  1  0  4  2 4.00  148/ 240 4.00   4.39  4.11  4.26  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0  0  0  1  6 4.86   43/ 219 4.86   4.59  4.44  4.42  4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5   0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83   45/ 215 4.83   4.45  4.35  4.28  4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4   0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71   30/ 198 4.71   4.45  4.18  4.21  4.71

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50   28/  52 4.50   2.75  4.04  4.84  4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7   0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50   18/  53 4.50   3.25  4.05  4.58  4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       7   0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75   26/  42 4.75   4.88  4.75  4.71  4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   7   0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75   20/  37 4.75   3.88  4.58  4.73  4.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7   0  0  0  0  3  1 4.25   24/  32 4.25   4.25  4.56  4.64  4.25

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A    1        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0     Major         1
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    7
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   3       C    1        General              1    Under-grad  11     Non-major    10
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49   0       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                9
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  411  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  904
Title       FLUVIAL MORPHOLOGY            Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MILLER, ANDREW  (Instr. A)         Fall   2007                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  7                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1639  5.00 4.40  4.27 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  4  3 4.43  650/1639  4.43 4.03  4.22 4.29  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3  4 4.57  447/1397  4.57 4.04  4.28 4.38  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  281/1583  4.71 4.02  4.19 4.31  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  2  3 4.33  506/1532  4.33 3.80  4.01 4.07  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 724/1504  4.14 3.93  4.05 4.20  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  3  4 4.57  418/1612  4.57 4.01  4.16 4.18  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  4  3 4.43 1215/1635  4.43 4.71  4.65 4.72  4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 128/1579  4.83 4.00  4.08 4.21  4.83

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  529/1518  4.71 4.45  4.43 4.51  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1520  5.00 4.71  4.70 4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 510/1517  4.57 4.14  4.27 4.34  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  231/1550  3.43 4.18  4.22 4.24  3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86  95/1295  4.86 4.25  3.94 4.01  4.86

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00    1/1398  5.00 3.94  4.07 4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00    1/1391  5.00 4.21  4.30 4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00   1/1388  5.00 4.24  4.28 4.50  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 958  **** 3.55  3.93 4.24  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  52  **** 2.75  4.04 4.84  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  53  **** 3.25  4.05 4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  42  **** 4.88  4.75 4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  37  **** 3.88  4.58 4.73  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  32  **** 4.25  4.56 4.64  ****

                              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       1
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                                       
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    2       C    1        General              1    Under-grad    7      Non-major   6
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49    0       D    0                                                       
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                6
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  411  0101             University of Maryland                             Page  905
Title      FLUVIAL MORPHOLOGY                 Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. C)            Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      13
Questionnaires:   7                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.40  4.27 4.42 5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43  650/1639   4.43  4.03  4.22 4.29 4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  447/1397   4.57  4.04  4.28 4.38 4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  281/1583   4.71  4.02  4.19 4.31 4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  506/1532   4.33  3.80  4.01 4.07 4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   1   1   4  4.14  724/1504   4.14  3.93  4.05 4.20 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  418/1612   4.57  4.01  4.16 4.18 4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43 1215/1635   4.43  4.71  4.65 4.72 4.43


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1398   5.00  3.94  4.07 4.23 5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1391   5.00  4.21  4.30 4.48 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1388   5.00  4.24  4.28 4.50 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 958   ****  3.55  3.93 4.24 ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  6  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52   ****  2.75  4.04 4.84 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  6  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53   ****  3.25  4.05 4.58 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42   ****  4.88  4.75 4.71 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    6  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37   ****  3.88  4.58 4.73 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  6  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32   ****  4.25  4.56 4.64 ****


                                    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         1
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    3
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    2        C    1          General              1      Under-grad     7      Non-major     6
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49    0        D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2        F    0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                6
                                            ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  462  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  906
Title       SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF CH           Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   NEFF, ROBERT                    Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires:  10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  391/1639  4.70  4.40  4.27  4.42  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  3  3  3  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.03  4.22  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  8  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1397  ****  4.04  4.28  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  371/1583  4.60  4.02  4.19  4.31  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  535/1532  4.30  3.80  4.01  4.07  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20  667/1504  4.20  3.93  4.05  4.20  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  756/1612  4.30  4.01  4.16  4.18  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.71  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  527/1579  4.38  4.00  4.08  4.21  4.38

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  6  3  4.20 1141/1518  4.20  4.45  4.43  4.51  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  546/1520  4.90  4.71  4.70  4.75  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  833/1517  4.30  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  716/1550  4.44  4.18  4.22  4.24  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  1  0  1  2  4  4.00  623/1295  4.00  4.25  3.94  4.01  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  5  3  4.22  651/1398  4.22  3.94  4.07  4.23  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  248/1391  4.89  4.21  4.30  4.48  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.24  4.28  4.50  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  4  0  1  1  2  1  3.60  682/ 958  3.60  3.55  3.93  4.24  3.60

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.27  4.10  4.49  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.39  4.11  4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 219  ****  4.59  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.45  4.35  4.28  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.45  4.18  4.21  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58  4.83  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52  4.49  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   41/  78  4.67  4.22  4.47  4.56  4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   58/  80  4.00  3.33  4.47  4.59  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   30/  82  4.67  4.22  4.16  4.02  4.67

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   26/  50  4.75  3.58  4.45  4.85  4.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    6  1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   22/  32  4.00  4.00  4.51  4.00  4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   30/  43  4.75  4.92  4.69  4.85  4.75
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       7  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   20/  32  4.33  3.44  4.37  4.67  4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     7  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   17/  21  4.00  3.00  4.52  4.50  4.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
P    0                                              responses to be significant
I    0              Other              8
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GES  481  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  907
Title          REMOTE SENSING OF ENV             Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    CAMPBELL, PETYA                   Fall  2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  3  3  0  3.29 1558/1639  3.29  4.40  4.27 4.42  3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  2  0  2  3  0  2.86 1608/1639  2.86  4.03  4.22 4.29  2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  0  0  3  3  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.04  4.28 4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  2  2  3.71 1289/1583  3.71  4.02  4.19 4.31  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  2  2  1  1  3.17 1390/1532  3.17  3.80  4.01 4.07  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1371/1504  3.17  3.93  4.05 4.20  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  2  0  2  2  1  3.00 1519/1612  3.00  4.01  4.16 4.18  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57 1087/1635  4.57  4.71  4.65 4.72  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 4 1 1 3.29 1409/1579  3.29  4.00  4.08 4.21  3.29

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  0  3  0  3  3.57 1408/1518  3.57  4.45  4.43 4.51  3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  1  1  2  3  4.00 1414/1520  4.00  4.71  4.70 4.75  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 2 1 2 1 3.00 1453/1517  3.00  4.14  4.27 4.34  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  2  0  3  1  3.14 1424/1550  3.14  4.18  4.22 4.24  3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 2 2 2 3.71  864/1295  3.71  4.25  3.94 4.01  3.71

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 1207/1398  3.25  3.94  4.07 4.23  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 1146/1391  3.75  4.21  4.30 4.48  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.24  4.28 4.50  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  2  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  841/ 958  3.00  3.55  3.93 4.24  3.00

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  85  ****  3.00  4.58 4.83  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.50  4.52 4.49  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.22  4.47 4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.22  4.16 4.02  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  621  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  908
Title        WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN          Baltimore County                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  REED, MARY LYNN (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  10                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   3   1   5  3.90 1252/1639  3.90  4.40  4.27  4.42  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   3   1   6   0  3.30 1542/1639  3.30  4.03  4.22  4.26  3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   2   5   1  3.40 1300/1397  3.40  4.04  4.28  4.37  3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   1   5   1   1  3.00 1532/1583  3.00  4.02  4.19  4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   2   3   4  4.22  607/1532  4.22  3.80  4.01  4.10  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  1   2   1   3   2  3.33 1303/1504  3.33  3.93  4.05  4.29  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   4   0   4   1   0  2.22 1592/1612  2.22  4.01  4.16  4.27  2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  855/1635  4.78  4.71  4.65  4.81  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   1   4   4   1  3.50 1318/1579  3.40  4.00  4.08  4.17  3.40

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   4   5  4.40  947/1518  3.60  4.45  4.43  4.49  3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   2   3   5  4.30 1338/1520  4.20  4.71  4.70  4.79  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   1   1   4   2  3.88 1199/1517  3.41  4.14  4.27  4.32  3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   1   5   3  4.00 1077/1550  3.70  4.18  4.22  4.23  3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  0   1   2   0   1  3.25 1101/1295  3.55  4.25  3.94  3.95  3.55

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   2   3   2  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07  4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   1   1   1   4  4.14  903/1391  4.14  4.21  4.30  4.47  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   3   1   3  4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.24  4.28  4.49  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   4   0   1   1   0   1  3.33  786/ 958  3.33  3.55  3.93  4.01  3.33

             Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47  4.50  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  621  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  909
Title        WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BRENNAN, TIMOTH (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  10               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  3  1  5  3.90 1252/1639  3.90  4.40  4.27  4.42  3.90
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  3  1  6  0  3.30 1542/1639  3.30  4.03  4.22  4.26  3.30
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  2  5  1  3.40 1300/1397  3.40  4.04  4.28  4.37  3.40
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  1  5  1  1  3.00 1532/1583  3.00  4.02  4.19  4.31  3.00
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  607/1532  4.22  3.80  4.01  4.10  4.22
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1  2  1  3  2  3.33 1303/1504  3.33  3.93  4.05  4.29  3.33
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  4  0  4  1  0  2.22 1592/1612  2.22  4.01  4.16  4.27  2.22
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  855/1635  4.78  4.71  4.65  4.81  4.78
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 2 2  4  2  0  2.60 1548/1579  3.40  4.00  4.08  4.17  3.40

              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  3  3  2  0  2  2.50 1504/1518  3.60  4.45  4.43  4.49  3.60
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  1  3  1  4  3.60 1485/1520  4.20  4.71  4.70  4.79  4.20
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  4  1  2  2  0  2.22 1508/1517  3.41  4.14  4.27  4.32  3.41
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  2  2  2  1  2  2.89 1465/1550  3.70  4.18  4.22  4.23  3.70
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1295  3.55  4.25  3.94  3.95  3.55

              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07  4.22  4.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  903/1391  4.14  4.21  4.30  4.47  4.14
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  0  3  1  3  4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.24  4.28  4.49  4.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  3   4  0  1  1  0  1  3.33  786/ 958  3.33  3.55  3.93  4.01  3.33

              Seminar
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47  4.50  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  621  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  910
Title        WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN            Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  MILLER, ANDREW  (Instr. C)          Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  0  3  1  5  3.90 1252/1639  3.90  4.40  4.27 4.42  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  3  1  6  0  3.30 1542/1639  3.30  4.03  4.22 4.26  3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  1  2  5  1  3.40 1300/1397  3.40  4.04  4.28 4.37  3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0  1  1  5  1  1  3.00 1532/1583  3.00  4.02  4.19 4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  607/1532  4.22  3.80  4.01 4.10  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 1 3 2  3.33 1303/1504  3.33  3.93  4.05 4.29  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  4  0  4  1  0  2.22 1592/1612  2.22  4.01  4.16 4.27  2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  855/1635  4.78  4.71  4.65 4.81  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 3 4  4.10  830/1579  3.40  4.00  4.08 4.17  3.40


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  1  3  2  4  3.90 1318/1518  3.60  4.45  4.43 4.49  3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  992/1520  4.20  4.71  4.70 4.79  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 3  4.13 1007/1517  3.41  4.14  4.27 4.32  3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20  944/1550  3.70  4.18  4.22 4.23  3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 1 0 2 0 4  3.86  768/1295  3.55  4.25  3.94 3.95  3.55


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 3 2  4.00  770/1398  4.00  3.94  4.07 4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 1 1 4  4.14  903/1391  4.14  4.21  4.30 4.47  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 3 1 3  4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.24  4.28 4.49  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   4  0  1  1  0  1  3.33  786/ 958  3.33  3.55  3.93 4.01  3.33

                 Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   9   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  3.33  4.47 4.50  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  622  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  911
Title         RES DESIGN/URBAN ENV          Baltimore County                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MILLER, ANDREW  (Instr. A)        Fall   2007                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   2   2  3.83 1303/1639  3.83  4.40  4.27  4.42  3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   4   0  3.50 1481/1639  3.50  4.03  4.22  4.26  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 1363/1397  3.00  4.04  4.28  4.37  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   2   1  3.50 1406/1583  3.50  4.02  4.19  4.31  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   1   0   4   0  3.17 1390/1532  3.17  3.80  4.01  4.10  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   2   1   3  4.17  701/1504  4.17  3.93  4.05  4.29  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   2   1   0   1  2.33 1586/1612  2.33  4.01  4.16  4.27  2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  766/1635  4.83  4.71  4.65  4.81  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  725/1579  4.10  4.00  4.08  4.17  4.10

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   4   1  4.00 1237/1518  4.10  4.45  4.43  4.49  4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50 1188/1520  4.45  4.71  4.70  4.79  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   3   1  3.83 1223/1517  3.92  4.14  4.27  4.32  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   1   0   2   2  3.50 1328/1550  3.35  4.18  4.22  4.23  3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  4   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  978/1295  3.50  4.25  3.94  3.95  3.50

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  511/1398  4.40  3.94  4.07  4.22  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  332/1391  4.80  4.21  4.30  4.47  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  328/1388  4.80  4.24  4.28  4.49  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0   0   0   2   3   0  3.60  682/ 958  3.60  3.55  3.93  4.01  3.60


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

```
Course-Section: GES  622  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  912
Title      RES DESIGN/URBAN ENV            Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. B)         Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  6                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83 1303/1639  3.83  4.40  4.27  4.42  3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  4  0  3.50 1481/1639  3.50  4.03  4.22  4.26  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 1363/1397  3.00  4.04  4.28  4.37  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  2  1  3.50 1406/1583  3.50  4.02  4.19  4.31  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  0  4  0  3.17 1390/1532  3.17  3.80  4.01  4.10  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  701/1504  4.17  3.93  4.05  4.29  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  2  1  0  1  2.33 1586/1612  2.33  4.01  4.16  4.27  2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  766/1635  4.83  4.71  4.65  4.81  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  889/1579  4.10  4.00  4.08  4.17  4.10

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20 1141/1518  4.10  4.45  4.43  4.49  4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 1273/1520  4.45  4.71  4.70  4.79  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00 1083/1517  3.92  4.14  4.27  4.32  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  1  0  2  1  3.20 1411/1550  3.35  4.18  4.22  4.23  3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1295  3.50  4.25  3.94  3.95  3.50

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  511/1398  4.40  3.94  4.07  4.22  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  332/1391  4.80  4.21  4.30  4.47  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  328/1388  4.80  4.24  4.28  4.49  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0  0  0  2  3  0  3.60  682/ 958  3.60  3.55  3.93  4.01  3.60


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

```
Course-Section: GES  681  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  913
Title       REMOTE SENSING OF ENVI          Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CAMPBELL, PETYA                 Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
Questionnaires: 1                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.40  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.03  4.22  4.26  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  973/1397   4.00  4.04  4.28  4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1010/1583   4.00  4.02  4.19  4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  774/1532   4.00  3.80  4.01  4.10  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1504   5.00  3.93  4.05  4.29  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1612   5.00  4.01  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1635   5.00  4.71  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  889/1579   4.00  4.00  4.08  4.17  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1518   5.00  4.45  4.43  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1520   5.00  4.71  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1083/1517   4.00  4.14  4.27  4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1550   5.00  4.18  4.22  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  623/1295   4.00  4.25  3.94  3.95  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1271/1398   3.00  3.94  4.07  4.22  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  983/1391   4.00  4.21  4.30  4.47  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  944/1388   4.00  4.24  4.28  4.49  4.00


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  686  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  914
Title       INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM        Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: JUNMEI, TANG   (Instr. A)     Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires:  3                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.40  4.27 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1579/1639   3.00  4.03  4.22 4.26  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  2  0  0  1  3.00 1363/1397   3.00  4.04  4.28 4.37  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1010/1583   4.00  4.02  4.19 4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 1486/1532   2.67  3.80  4.01 4.10  2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1  0  1  3.33 1303/1504   3.33  3.93  4.05 4.29  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1327/1612   3.67  4.01  4.16 4.27  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1635   5.00  4.71  4.65 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 1 1  0  3.00 1477/1579   3.50  4.00  4.08 4.17  3.50

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 1021/1518   4.67  4.45  4.43 4.49  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1414/1520   4.50  4.71  4.70 4.79  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1453/1517   4.00  4.14  4.27 4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 1483/1550   3.83  4.18  4.22 4.23  3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 1 0  1  3.00 1158/1295   4.00  4.25  3.94 3.95  4.00

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1  0  0  0  1  3.00 1271/1398   3.00  3.94  4.07 4.22  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1  0  0  1  3.50 1220/1391   3.50  4.21  4.30 4.47  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1  0  1  4.00  944/1388   4.00  4.24  4.28 4.49  4.00

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0   0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67  218/ 224   2.67  4.27  4.10 4.43  2.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 1 0  2  4.33  115/ 240   4.33  4.39  4.11 3.96  4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 0 1 0  0  2  4.00  179/ 219   4.00  4.59  4.44 4.23  4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          0   0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67  194/ 215   3.67  4.45  4.35 4.72  3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   38/ 198   4.67  4.45  4.18 4.74  4.67

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1 1 0 0 1  0  0  3.00   84/  85   3.00  3.00  4.58 4.58  3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 1 0 0 0 0 1  1  4.50   47/  82   4.50  4.50  4.52 4.74  4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1  0  1  4.00   53/  78   4.00  4.22  4.47 4.52  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   1   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00   78/  80   3.00  3.33  4.47 4.50  3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               1   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   49/  82   4.00  4.22  4.16 4.37  4.00

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00   48/  52   1.00  2.75  4.04 3.64  1.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00   50/  53   2.00  3.25  4.05 4.03  2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  42   5.00  4.88  4.75 4.78  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  2   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   36/  37   3.00  3.88  4.58 4.33  3.00

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0  0  0  1  3.00   46/  50   3.00  3.58  4.45 4.39  3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   1   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   22/  32   4.00  4.00  4.51 4.50  4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     1   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  43   5.00  4.92  4.69 4.61  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      1   0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00   27/  32   3.00  3.44  4.37 4.31  3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    1   0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50   20/  21   2.50  3.00  4.52 4.42  2.50
```

Title   INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: JUNMEI, TANG   (Instr. A)   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 3   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GES  686  0101          University of Maryland                              Page  915
Title       INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM       Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  JUNMEI, TANG   (Instr. B)        Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  3                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1639  5.00  4.40  4.27 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1579/1639  3.00  4.03  4.22 4.26  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  0  0  1  3.00 1363/1397  3.00  4.04  4.28 4.37  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.02  4.19 4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 1486/1532  2.67  3.80  4.01 4.10  2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 0 1  3.33 1303/1504  3.33  3.93  4.05 4.29  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1327/1612  3.67  4.01  4.16 4.27  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.71  4.65 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  889/1579  3.50  4.00  4.08 4.17  3.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1518  4.67  4.45  4.43 4.49  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1520  4.50  4.71  4.70 4.79  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1517  4.00  4.14  4.27 4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1550  3.83  4.18  4.22 4.23  3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00    1/1295  4.00  4.25  3.94 3.95  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 1271/1398  3.00  3.94  4.07 4.22  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1220/1391  3.50  4.21  4.30 4.47  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00  944/1388  4.00  4.24  4.28 4.49  4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  0   0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67  218/ 224  2.67  4.27  4.10 4.43  2.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 1 0 2  4.33  115/ 240  4.33  4.39  4.11 3.96  4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 0 1 0 0 2  4.00  179/ 219  4.00  4.59  4.44 4.23  4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           0   0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67  194/ 215  3.67  4.45  4.35 4.72  3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   38/ 198  4.67  4.45  4.18 4.74  4.67

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   84/  85  3.00  3.00  4.58 4.58  3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 1 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50   47/  82  4.50  4.50  4.52 4.74  4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   53/  78  4.00  4.22  4.47 4.52  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    1   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00   78/  80  3.00  3.33  4.47 4.50  3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                1   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   49/  82  4.00  4.22  4.16 4.37  4.00

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00   48/  52  1.00  2.75  4.04 3.64  1.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  2  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00   50/  53  2.00  3.25  4.05 4.03  2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  42  5.00  4.88  4.75 4.78  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   2   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   36/  37  3.00  3.88  4.58 4.33  3.00

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00   46/  50  3.00  3.58  4.45 4.39  3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    1   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   22/  32  4.00  4.00  4.51 4.50  4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      1   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  43  5.00  4.92  4.69 4.61  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       1   0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00   27/  32  3.00  3.44  4.37 4.31  3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     1   0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50   20/  21  2.50  3.00  4.52 4.42  2.50
```

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 3   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

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