Course-Section: GES 102 0201

Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT

Enrollment: 125
Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 883 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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	4.17	746/1388	4.39	4.21	4.28	4.07	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	18	49	4	1	3	2	9		****/ 958	****		3.93	3.71	****
4. Were special techniques successiui	10	49	4	1	3	۷	9	3.30	/ 956		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		****/ 240	****	4.39	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 219	****	4.59	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	2	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 215	****	4.45	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****	4.45	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	83	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 78	****	4.22	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	4	1	1		****/ 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														
	0.2	0	2	0	0	1	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	2 75	4.04	2 61	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	83	0	1	0	-	_	-		,	****	2.75		3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	83				1	1	0		****/ 53	****	3.25	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	83 83	1 1	0	0	0 1	1	1 1		****/ 42 ****/ 37	****	4.88	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		1	0	0	1	0	_		****/ 32	****	3.88	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	83	Т	U	U	Т	U	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		****/ 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		****/ 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		5.00	****

Course-Section: GES 102 0201
Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Title HUMAN GEOGRAM
Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT

Enrollment: 125
Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 883 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	 А	24	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GES 102 0301
Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY
Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J

113

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 884 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions						377		_	ncie		-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions 	; 		NR 	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank 	меаn 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	_															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	5	20	17	35	4.06	1044/1639	4.10	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.06
	_	uestions reflect	_	9	1	0	2	7	11	24	32		969/1397		4.04	4.28	4.18	4.01
		uations reflect	_	_	0	41	2	2	10	9	13		1226/1583		4.02	4.19	4.01	3.81
	_	eadings contribu		-	0	3	0	5	19	24	26	3.96	842/1532		3.80	4.01	3.88	3.96
				what you learned	1	50	5	2	4	4	11		1194/1504		3.93	4.05	3.78	3.54
		g system clearly		ied	1	1	0	4	7	17	47	4.43	603/1612		4.01	4.16	4.10	4.43
	_	was class cance		55 . '	1	1	0	1	3	56	15		1434/1635		4.71	4.65	4.56	4.13
9. How wou	ald you g	grade the overal	.1 teachi	ng effectiveness	3	1	0	0	14	34	25	4.15	772/1579	4.02	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.15
		Lecture	9															
		actor's lectures	_	_	1	0	0	2	1	19	54	4.64	629/1518		4.45	4.43	4.38	4.64
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	3	2	9	62	4.71	961/1520		4.71	4.70	4.61	4.71
		terial presented			1	0	2	2	8	24	40	4.29	854/1517			4.27	4.20	4.29
		es contribute to	_		1	0	1	4	6	20	45	4.37	805/1550		4.18	4.22	4.17	4.37
Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance you	ır understanding	1	1	6	2	13	23	31	3.95	687/1295	4.09	4.25	3.94	3.84	3.95
		Discuss																
l. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	71	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1398	4.10	3.94	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	71	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	****/1391	4.17	4.21	4.30	4.07	****
				open discussion	66	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	****/1388	4.39	4.24	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		71	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 958	****	3.55	3.93	3.71	****
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understar	_	the material	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.27	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	e backgr	ound information	75	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.39	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avail	able for	lab activities	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.59	4.44	4.44	****
1. Did the	e lab ins	structor provide	assista	ince	75	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.45	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.45	4.18	4.25	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				D.o.	ason	c			Ту	ne			Majors				
00-27							quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 4	:3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В 28		_							1	, -	_			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 17		Gei	nera	T				9	Under-g	rad 7	7	Non-	-major	75
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								0						,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Εle	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	n
	P 0										-	0	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
				I 0		Utl	ner				1	.0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: GES 105 0101

Questions

Title WORLD REGIONAL GEOG

Instructor: STEELE, CHRISTO

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 885

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank

Instructor

		Genera	1																
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	0	6	20	21	4.25	890/	1639	4.25	4.40	4.27	4.08	4.25
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	2	8	21	18		992/			4.03	4.22		4.12
		estions reflec			0	0	0	4	6	13							4.28		
	_	ations reflect		=	1	1	2	2	8				1143/					4.01	
				what you learned		0		5									4.01		
				o what you learned		0	2	6	6								4.05		
		system clearl			3	0	0	3	6	16			882/					4.10	
		was class canc			3	0		0									4.65		
	-			hing effectiveness	12	2	2	2					1117/					3.95	
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	2	6	4	22	12	3.78	1357/	1518	3.78	4.45	4.43	4.38	3.78
				n the subject	2	0				5							4.70		
				xplained clearly	4					18							4.27		
		es contribute t			2	0	1	3	4	18	21	4.17	963/	1550	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.17	4.17
				our understanding	3												3.94		
1. Did cla	ass discu	Discus Ussions contrib		what you learned	8	0	0	2	7	14	18	4.17	688/	1398	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.85	4.17
				d to participate	8	0	1		10	7							4.30		
				d open discussion		0	0			15							4.28		
		chniques succe		a open arroadren		23	6	1		4							3.93		
		Labora	torv																
2. Were yo	ou provid		_	ground information	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	240	****	4.39	4.11	4.01	****
		Semina	r																
4 Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute		vou learned	47	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/	80	****	3 33	4.47	4 39	****
_		for grading mad		-	47	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/	82	***		4.16		****
		Field	Work																
1 Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/	52	****	2 75	4.04	3 61	****
				uation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	0			****/				4.05		
		9.15																	
1 Did sel	lf_naged	Self :		what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	Λ	1 00	****/	50	****	3 50	4.45	4 54	****
		k/tutoring by				1											4.37		****
				Frequ	ency	Diet	-rihı	ıtio	n										
		Cum. GPA		_	cricy	DISC		acio											
Credits Ea	Expected Grades					ason					Тур				Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 18								3		duate		0	Majo		0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 9															
56-83	6	2.00-2.99		C 6		Ger	neral	1			1	2	Unde	er-gr	ad 4	19	Non-	major	49
84-150	5	3.00-3.49		D 1															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0					re not	_	h
				P 1									resp	onse	s to b	e sign	ifican	.t	
				I 1		Otł	ner					1							
				? 1															

Course-Section: GES 110 0101

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Title Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA

Enrollment: 75 Questionnaires: 33

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 886 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		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		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		****/ 240	****	4.39	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	4.59	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 78		4.22	4.47	4.25	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 52		2.75	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53		3.25	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42		4.88	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 50		3.58	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1				4.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43		4.92	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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

Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA

Enrollment: 75
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 886 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	 А	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 110 0201 University of Maryland PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY Baltimore County RABENHORST, THO

Title

Instructor:

Page 887 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	81			
Questionnaires:	43	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Ι	Freg	uen	cies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	. N	A :	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	e 0	1	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	3 0	1	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	3	2 (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 lear	ned 0)	5 2	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 le	earned 0	3	5 (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 effective	reness 8	1	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 clea	arly 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 understan	nding 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 lear	ned 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 particip	ate 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 discus	sion 31		0 (0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1095/1388	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.01	3.7
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 materia	al 42	!	0 (0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.27	4.10	3.90	***
	Frequenc	y D	istr	ibut	ion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	Grades				Reas	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.27 0 0.00.0.00 1 7.10										Craduat		0			

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: GES 110 0301 University of Maryland Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Baltimore County

Fall 2007 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF

Enrollment: 83 Questionnaires: 60

Page 888 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General	_	^	2	4	0	1.4	2.1	4 10	1060/1620	4 05	4 40	4 07	4 00	4 10
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3 1	4 5	8 8	14 16	31 30	4.10	1068/1639	4.25		4.27	4.08	4.10 4.15
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	1	4	4	23	28	4.15	959/1639 831/1397	4.29 4.37	4.03	4.22 4.28	4.17 4.18	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	33	1	3	5	43 6	11		1171/1583	3.95	4.04	4.19	4.10	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	<i>5</i>	8	14	30	4.16	663/1532	4.10	3.80	4.19	3.88	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	46	3	0	1	3	30 7		****/1504	3.78	3.93	4.01	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	8	15	34	4.37		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		4.90	4.71	4.65	4.10	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	3	6	27	10			4.03	4.00	4.08		3.96
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	O	3	O	۷,	10	3.70	212/13/2	1.05	1.00	1.00	3.75	3.50
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		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		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		****/ 240	****		4.11		****
2. Here you provided with adequate Sacriffonia information	50	Ü	Ü	_	ŭ	_	Ü	3.00	, 210		1.33		1.01	
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		****/ 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	2 61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	3.25	4.04	3.61 3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 42	****	4.88	4.05	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	3.88	4.73	5.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32	****	4.25	4.56	4.60	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	2	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	32		4.25	4.50	4.00	
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	****
_		- 5 2 - 1	2.1											
Frequ	.ency	νıst	ribi	ut 101	1									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	13	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	27						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	L1	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	1

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 .

Course-Section: GES 120 0101

University of Maryland ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI

Title Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE

Enrollment: 125 Questionnaires: 54 Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 889 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		4.71	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		4.14	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		4.18	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		1023/1398		3.94	4.07	3.85	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	5	8	3	12		1132/1391		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		4.24	4.28		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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

Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI

Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE

Enrollment: 125
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 889 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 11	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 220 0101

Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE

Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 8

DEL, KARIN Fall 2007

Page 890 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	_	ncie:	5 1	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
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		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	- ,	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		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		3.93	4.05	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1198/1612		4.01	4.16	4.21	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	3		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		4.18	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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: GES 280 0101 University of Maryland Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI

Baltimore County SCHOOL, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 28

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 891 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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
_			2 1											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: GES 280 0101 University of Maryland

Title MAP USE/CARTOGRAPH PRI Baltimo Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH (Instr. B) Fall

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 892

							Fr	eauei	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	. Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	342/1639	4.73	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.73
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	583/1639	4.47	4.03	4.22	4.27	4.47
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.20
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	572/1583		4.02	4.19	4.28	4.43
				what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1136/1532		3.80	4.01	4.09	3.67
				to what you learned	0	2	0	4	2	2	5	3.62	1147/1504		3.93	4.05	4.09	3.62
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	459/1612	4.53	4.01	4.16	4.21	4.53
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.80
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	569/1579	4.42	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.42
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	947/1518	4.53	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.53
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.78	5.00
				explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	947/1517	4.37		4.27	4.34	4.37
		es contribute t			9	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550		4.18	4.22	4.33	4.77
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.73	4.25	3.94	4.07	4.73
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.14	4.00
				ed to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	793/1391	4.29	4.21	4.30	4.35	4.29
				nd 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	esstul		8	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 958	****	3.55	3.93	4.00	****
		Labora	-				•				_							
				of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.33	5.00
_	_	_		ground information	10	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.39	4.11	4.47	4.80
	_			for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	4.59	4.44		5.00
		structor provid nts for lab rep		stance learly specified	10 10	0	0	0 0	0 0	1	4 2	4.80	51/ 215 75/ 198	4.80 4.40	4.45 4.45	4.35 4.18	4.43	4.80
	-	-		Frequ	onat	. Dia	- rib	u+i o	2									
		_	ency	DIS	LIID	uLIO	1											
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected							Rea	asons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 10				_				_	_	_	_			_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			. ,					0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0			0.030				_	_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	

Other

15

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: GES 305 0101

Title LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY

Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 893 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	c		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5	5		tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion	5 									Mean	Raiik		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	l you gain	new insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	469/1639	4.64	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.64
		ructor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1319/1639		4.03	4.22	4.20	3.82
		questions reflec		-	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	935/1397		4.04	4.28	4.26	4.10
		aluations reflect		- 3	0	0	0	1	2	5	3		1158/1583		4.02	4.19	4.24	3.91
	_	readings contrib		-	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	640/1532		3.80	4.01	4.05	4.18
		-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	667/1504		3.93	4.05	4.12	4.20
	_	ing system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	449/1612		4.01	4.16	4.12	4.55
		es was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635		4.71	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.20
		Lectur																
		tructor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	213/1518			4.43	4.39	4.91
		ructor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	547/1517		4.14	4.27		4.55		
		ares contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	591/1550		4.18	4.22	4.20	4.55
5. Did	l audiovisu	our understanding	0	1	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	505/1295	4.20	4.25	3.94	3.95	4.20		
		Discus	sion															
		scussions contrib			6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.00
2. Wer	e all stud	dents actively en	courage	d 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	l the instr	ructor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.24	4.28	4.34	4.60
4. Wer	re special	techniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.55	3.93	3.97	3.75
		Semina																
4. Did	l presentat	tions 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 degre	ee could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.88	4.58	4.52	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$	
00-27		A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1		
28-55		В 4				_				_	_	_						
56-83		2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	nera!	Τ				3	Under-g	rad 1	L1	Non-	major	10
84-15		3.00-3.49	1 2	D 0		-						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	there a	re not	enoug	jh	

Other

4

I 0

Title ECOLOGY
Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 894 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
		ew insights,skills		2	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	,			4.27	4.28	4.61
		ctor make clear the		2	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43			4.03	4.22	4.20	4.43
		estions reflect th		2	0	0	2	3	8	15	4.29	767/1397		4.04	4.28	4.26	4.29
		ations reflect the		2	6	1	3	1	5	12	4.09	946/1583		4.02	4.19	4.24	4.09
	-	_	to what you learned	2	1	7	2	9	3	6		1437/1532		3.80	4.01	4.05	2.96
		9	e to what you learned	2	4	1	2	6	6	9	3.83	990/1504		3.93	4.05	4.12	3.83
		g system clearly ex		2	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	- ,		4.01	4.16	4.12	4.57
	-	was class cancelle		2	0	0	0	0	20	8		1326/1635		4.71	4.65	4.66	4.29
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overall t	eaching 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 th	he instru	actor's lectures we	ll 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	e instruc	ctor seem intereste	d 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 led	cture mat	terial presented an	d 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	e lecture	es contribute to wh	at 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 aud	diovisual	l techniques enhanc	e your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	209/1295	4.63	4.25	3.94	3.95	4.63
1 Did al		Discussion	to what you learned	1.0	0	0	2	5	3	2	2 42	1156/1398	3.42	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.42
			aged to participate	18 18	0	2	2	4	1	3		1310/1390		4.21	4.07	4.13	3.42
			and open discussion	18	0	3	0	1	4			1185/1388		4.21	4.28	4.34	3.50
		echniques successfu		19	5	1	1	3	1	0		****/ 958		3.55	3.93		****
2 None n	000000	Laboratory	e for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 219	****	4.59	4.44	1 11	****
3. Were In	ecessary	materials availabl	e for lab accivities	23	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 219		4.39	4.44	7.77	
		Seminar															
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute to w	hat you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.33	4.47	4.65	****
		Field Work															
4. To what	t degree	could you discuss		29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.88	4.58	4.52	****
			Frequ	encv	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9		Re	guir	ed f	or M	ajor	:	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	В 10		_	=			J						3		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	С 6		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 3	30	Non-	-major	29
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
			P 0									respons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot]	her				2	21						
			? 1														

Course-Section: GES 311 0101 Title

WEATHER AND CLIMATE

Instructor: TOKAY, ALI

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 29

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 895 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	18	4.41	740/1639	4.41	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.41
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	3	7	17	4.31	800/1639		4.03	4.22	4.20	4.31
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	2	4	7	15	4.14	906/1397	4.14	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.14
	_	uations reflect		_	0	6	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	611/1583	4.39	4.02	4.19	4.24	4.39
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	0	7	19	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.01	4.16	4.12	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	18	10	4.36	1273/1635	4.36	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.36
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	13	6	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	3	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	368/1295	4.38	4.25	3.94	3.95	4.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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
		-	_	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		16	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 958	****	3.55	3.93	3.97	***
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.27	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were ye	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.39	4.11	4.08	****
	_			or lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.59	4.44	4.44	****
		structor provid			27	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 215	****	4.45	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.45	4.18	4.04	***
		Field																
4. To wha	t degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.88	4.58	4.52	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27	1	0 00 0 00										1						
00-27	1 2	0.00-0.99	0 0	A 7 B 10		ке	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	4	B 10 C 8		0	nera	1				8	IIndox	~~d ~	29	Mon	ma i a	24
56-83 84-150	4	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	4 5	D 1		Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rau 2	39	non-	-major	24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		רים.	ecti [.]	17AC				1	#### - 1	Means +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		11.1	CCLI	vca				_	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	her				1	.4	1 00 20110	L	.c bigi	cai		
				? 0		0.01					-	-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: GES 313 0101

42

BIOGEOGRAPHY

LEWIS, LAURA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 34

Page 896 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	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	l 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	****
Fred	uency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	;			Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	=			
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 326 0101 University of Maryland Title CONSERVATION THOUGHT Baltimore County

CONSERVATION THOUGHT Baltimore County PARKER, EUGENE Fall 2007

Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 897 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	.1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	2	2	4	21	4.52	604/1639	4.52	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.52
_	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	2	6	6	15	4.17	937/1639	4.17	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.17
		estions reflec			1	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	687/1397		4.04	4.28	4.26	4.38
	_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.02	4.19	4.24	4.38
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	19	4.41	478/1504	4.41	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.41
		system clearl		ined	1	0	1	2	4	5	17	4.21	872/1612	4.21	4.01	4.16	4.12	4.21
	-	was class cand			1	1	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.75
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	302/1579	4.58	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.58
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.93		
		xplained clearly	2	0	0	5	2	8	13		1065/1517	4.04	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.04		
		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 au	diovisual	techniques er	our understanding	1	5	1	0	6	9	8	3.96	677/1295	3.96	4.25	3.94	3.95	3.96	
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	13	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	831/1391	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.35	4.24
		_		d open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	1	14	4.53	631/1388		4.24	4.28	4.34	4.53
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		13	0	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	603/ 958	3.76	3.55	3.93	3.97	3.76
		Labora	itory															
				ground information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.39	4.11	4.08	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provid	le assis	tance	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.45	4.35	4.21	****
		Semina	ır															
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for ind	ividual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.78	***
		Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ut.io	n											
		_																
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	S
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	7
28-55																		
56-83							nera	1				9	Under-g	rad 3	30	Non-	-major	23
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti [,]	ves				2	#### - 1				_	gh.
				P 0		O+.	her				1	6	respons	es to k	e sign	ııııcar	ıt	
	I 0										Т	.6						

Course-Section: GES 330 0101

GEOG OF ECON DEVELOPME

Title BENNETT, SARI J Instructor:

Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 898 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	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 ne	ew insights,skil	ls from this course	е	1	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	642/1639	4.48	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.48
2.	Did the	instruc	ctor 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 qu	estions reflect	the expected goals	s	1	0	0	2	6	7	10	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.00
4.	Did othe	r evalu	ations reflect	the expected goals		1	21	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1583	****	4.02	4.19	4.24	****
5.	Did assi	gned re	eadings contribu	te to what you lear	rned	2	0	1	0	6	5	12	4.13	685/1532	4.13	3.80	4.01	4.05	4.13
6.	Did writ	ten ass	signments contri	bute to what you le	earned	2	22	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1504	****	3.93	4.05	4.12	***
7.	Was the	grading	g 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 cance	lled		2	0	0	0	3	16	5	4.08	1462/1635	4.08	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.08
9.	How woul	d you g	grade the overal	l teaching effective	veness	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	instru	actor'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	instruc	t	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.88		
3.	Was lect	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clea						0	3	1	6	13	4.26	875/1517	4.26	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.26
4.	Did the	lecture	es 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 audi	ovisual	l techniques enh	ance your understar	nding	2	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	247/1295	4.54	4.25	3.94	3.95	4.54
			Discuss	ion															
1.	Did clas	s discu	ussions contribu	te to what you lear	rned	11	0	0	0	6	4	5	3.93	851/1398	3.93	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.93
2.	Were all	studer	nts actively end	ouraged to particin	pate	11	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	808/1391	4.27	4.21	4.30	4.35	4.27
3.	Did the	instruc	ctor encourage f	air and open discus	ssion	11	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.34	4.33
4.	Were spe	cial te	echniques succes	sful		11	14	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	****	3.55	3.93	3.97	***
			Laborat	ory															
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activit						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.59	4.44	4.44	****
					Freque	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	n									
Cre	dits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA	Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	5	
	1-27 1-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	2 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Course-Section: GES 381 0101

16

REMOTE SENSING

RABENHORST, THO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

.and Page 899 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
. 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	4.7
. 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	4.2
. 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	4.2
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
Lecture														
. 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.
. 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.
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
. 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.
. 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 .
Discussion														
. 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.
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
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
Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.55	3.93	3.97	*
Laboratory														
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
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
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
. 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
. 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
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	ŀ			Re	ason	S			Ту	pe.			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEI

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2007

Page 900 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did	vou gain	new insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	8	4 06	1096/1639	4.06	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.06
	1 0	uctor make clear			0	0	1	3	7	3	2		1572/1639		4.03	4.22	4.20	3.13
		questions reflect	_	_	0	0	3	2	5	4	2		1363/1397		4.04	4.28	4.26	3.00
		luations reflect		_	0	1	1	1	6	5	2		1449/1583		4.02	4.19	4.24	3.40
		readings contrib	-		1	1	1	1	2	4	6		883/1532		3.80	4.01	4.05	3.93
	_	-		what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	7	2		1098/1504		3.93	4.05	4.12	3.69
		ng system clearly		_	2	0	1	2	3	4	4		1371/1612		4.01	4.16	4.12	3.57
		s was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635		4.71	4.65	4.66	5.00
				ning effectiveness	2	2	1	2	8	1	0		1531/1579		4.00	4.08	4.07	
		Lecture	2															
1. Wer	e the inst	ructor's lectures	s well :	orepared	1	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1293/1518	3.93	4.45	4.43	4.39	3.93
		uctor seem intere	_	-	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.33
		aterial presented			1	0	1	5	4	3	2	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	4.14	4.27	4.23	3.00
		res contribute to			1	0	2	3	6	2	2	2.93	1456/1550	2.93	4.18	4.22	4.20	2.93
				our understanding	1	0	2	1	4	5	3	3.40	1035/1295		4.25	3.94	3.95	3.40
		Discus																
1. Did	class dis	cussions contribu	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. Wer	e all stud	ents actively end	d 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 instr	uctor encourage	d open discussion	10	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	1387/1388	1.67	4.24	4.28	4.34	1.67	
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did	the lab i	ncrease understar	nding of	f the material	3	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	120/ 224	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.06	4.08
2. Wer	e you prov	ided with adequat	te back	ground information	3	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	186/ 240	3.77	4.39	4.11	4.08	3.77
3. Wer	e necessar	y materials avai:	lable fo	or 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 i	nstructor provide	e assist	tance	3	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	158/ 215	4.00	4.45	4.35	4.21	4.00
5. Wer	e requirem	ents for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	3	0	3	0	1	4	5	3.62	167/ 198	3.62	4.45	4.18	4.04	3.62
		Semina																
	_	topics relevant			15	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	,		3.00	4.58	4.50	****
				ividual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,		4.50	4.52	4.59	****
		projects contrib		_	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	, -		4.22	4.47	4.60	****
	_	ions contribute t		you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,		3.33	4.47	4.65	****
5. Wer	e criteria		15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	***		
			Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	utior	1										
Credit	s Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	в 8			_			_						J -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera:	l				3	Under-g	rad 1	L6	Non-	major	8
84-15	0 4	D 0																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El€	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				- 0	Other							-						

Other

11

0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

13

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	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 $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($	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	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Re	anir	 ed f	or Ma	aior		1	Graduat		0	Maio		7

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY

Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 902

13 Ouestionnaires: 11

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	4.40	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	2	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	4.07	4.48	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.25	944/1388	4.25	4.21	4.28	4.50	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	456/ 958		3.55		4.24	
4. Were special techniques successiul	,	U	U	U		4		4.00	450/ 956	4.00	3.33	3.93	7.27	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	_	•	•	0	•	_	•	4 50	00/ 50	4 50	0 55	4 0 4	4 0 4	4 50
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 3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	18/ 53	4.50	3.25	4.05	4.58	4.50
	7 7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75 4.75	26/ 42	4.75	4.88	4.75	4.71	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	/	U	U	U	U	Τ	3	4./5	20/ 37	4.75	3.88	4.58	4.73	4.75

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

7 0 0

0 0 3 1 4.25 24/ 32 4.25 4.25 4.56 4.64 4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: GES 406 0101
Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 903 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	equei	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did you	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	469/163	9 4.64	4.40	4.27	4.42	4.64
_	-	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	284/163		4.03	4.22	4.29	4.73
		estions reflec	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	223/139		4.04	4.28	4.38	4.82
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	536/158		4.02	4.19	4.31	4.45
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	911/153		3.80	4.01	4.07	3.91
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	441/150		3.93	4.05	4.20	4.44
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73			4.01	4.16	4.18	4.73
		was class canc		nea	0	0	0	0	0	4	7		1034/163		4.71	4.65	4.72	4.64
	-			ing effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	889/157		4.00	4.08	4.21	4.00
		T. a. arbanan																
1 Woma +1	ho inat	Lectur		ropared	9	0	0	Λ	0	0	2	E 00	****/151	2 1 00	1 15	1 12	/ E1	1 00
		ctor's lecture	_	-			0	0	•	0	_		****/151 ****/152		4.45	4.43	4.51	4.80
		tor seem inter		_	9 9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/152		4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00 4.80
		_		plained clearly									****/151		4.14	4.27	4.34	
		es contribute t	_		8	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/155		4.18	4.22	4.24	4.80
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/129	5 4.50	4.25	3.94	4.01	4.50
		Discus																
				nat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	625/139		3.94	4.07	4.23	4.25
				to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/139		4.21	4.30	4.48	4.25
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	944/138	3 4.00	4.24	4.28	4.50	4.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	456/ 95	3 4.00	3.55	3.93	4.24	4.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding of	the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	37/ 22	4.71	4.27	4.10	4.49	4.71
2. Were yo	ou provid	led with adequa	te backg	round information	4	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	148/ 24	4.00	4.39	4.11	4.26	4.00
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avai	lable for	r lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	43/ 21	4.86	4.59	4.44	4.42	4.86
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	45/ 21	4.83	4.45	4.35	4.28	4.83
		its for lab rep			4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	30/ 19			4.18	4.21	4.71
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribu	te to wh	at you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	28/ 5	2 4.50	2.75	4.04	4.84	4.50
	_	understand yo		_	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	18/ 5	3 4.50	3.25	4.05	4.58	4.50
_	_	tor available			7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	26/ 4		4.88	4.75	4.71	
		could you disc			7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/ 3		3.88	4.58	4.73	4.75
	_	help you carr	_		7	0	0	0	0	3	1		24/ 3		4.25		4.64	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons				Tr.	уре			Majors	
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0 0	A 1 B 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Gradua	ce	0	Majo	or	1
		1.00-1.99				C c ·	0000	1				1	IIndo	d	1	Morr	mo i o	1.0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3			Gei	nera	Τ				1	Under-	grau .	L1	non-	-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		m2						0		Maana				.la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		ETe	ecti	ves				0		Means t			_	111
				P 0		~· •						0	respon	ses to b	oe sıgr	niicar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						
				? 1														

Course-Section: GES 411 0101

Title FLUVIAL MORPHOLOGY
Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 904 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

								Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	650/1639	4.43	4.03	4.22	4.29	4.43
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the	expected go	als	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	4.57	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.57
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.71
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you 1	earned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.33
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute 1	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 t	he gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained		0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.01	4.16	4.18	4.57
8. How m	nany times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1215/1635	4.43	4.71	4.65	4.72	4.43
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effec	tiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.83	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.83
		Lecture	е																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s 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 t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subj	ect	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presented	d and	explained c	learly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.57
		es contribute to		_	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	3.43	4.18	4.22	4.24	3.43
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance :	your unders	tanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.86	4.25	3.94	4.01	4.86
		Discus	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you 1	earned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.94	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to parti	cipate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.21	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage :	fair a	nd open dis	cussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.50	5.00
		echniques succes		-		5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.55	3.93	4.24	****
		Field V	Work																
1. Did f	ield expe	rience contribut	te to	what you le	arned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.84	***
2. Did y	ou clearl	y understand you	ır eva	luation cri	teria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.25	4.05	4.58	***
3. Was t	he instru	ctor available :	for co	nsultation		6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.88	4.75	4.71	***
4. To wh	at degree	could you disc	uss yo	ur evaluati	ons	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	***	3.88	4.58	4.73	***
		s help you carry				6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.56	4.64	****
					Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	
				EAPECLE											- 				,
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A B	2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1		Cor	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	major	6

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: GES 411 0101 University of Maryland Page 905 Title FLUVIAL MORPHOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF CH

Title NEFF, ROBERT Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Fall 2007

Page 906

Student Co	ourse Evalu	ation Ques	stionnaire
------------	-------------	------------	------------

University of Maryland

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings system clearly explained 9. Did assign system clearly explained 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did dudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussio
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 2 4 4 4.20 667/1504 4.20 3.38 4.01 4.07 4.30 9. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. User the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase und
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 8. August 1. Aug
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 4 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 0 2 3 5 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 1/141/1518 4.20 4.45 4.43 4.51 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 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 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0
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 0 1 3 4 4.38 527/1579 4.38 4.00 4.08 4.21 4.38 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 3 4.20 1141/1518 4.20 4.45 4.43 4.51 4.20 9. Was lecture material presented in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 546/1520 4.90 4.71 4.70 4.75 4.90 9. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 833/1517 4.30 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.30 9. Was lecture scontribute 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 0 1 5 3 4.22 651/1398 4.22 3.94 4.07 4.23 4.22 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 248/1391 4.89 4.21 4.30 4.48 4.89 9. 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 ****/ 240 **** 4.27 4.10 4.49 **** 2.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ***/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ***/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ***/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ***/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ***/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 4.00 ***/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 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 5.00 ****/ 24
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 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 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.01 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02
Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9. O. O. O. O. D. D. S. A. 4.20 1141/1518 4.20 4.45 4.43 4.51 4.20 9. O. O. O. D. D. D. S. 4.40 4.30 833/1517 4.30 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.30 9. O. O. O. D. D. D. S. 4.40 4.44 716/1550 4.44 4.18 4.22 4.24 4.44 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. O. O. O. D.
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 0 1 5 4 4.30 833/1517 4.30 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.30 4.14 5. 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0
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 4.16 1.20 4.20 4.24 4.44 5. 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0
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 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 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 1 8 4.89 248/1391 4.89 4.21 4.30 4.48 4.89 4.01 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00
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 1 5.00 ****/240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
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 1 5.00 ****/240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
Discussion Discus
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 0 1 5.00 ****/219 **** 4.59 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
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 0 1 5.00 ****/219 **** 4.59 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
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 1 5.00 ****/240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/219 **** 4.59 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
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 1 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.39 4.11 4.26 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 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 ****
A. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material Were you provided with adequate background information Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 5.00 ****/ 224 **** 4.27 4.10 4.49 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9. 0. 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. 0. 1. 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 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 1 5.00 **** 215 *** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ***
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 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.45 4.35 4.28 ****
Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $$ 8 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	ί

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

Course-Section: GES 481 0101 University of Maryland Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV Baltimore County

CAMPBELL, PETYA

Instructor:

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 907

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								~										
								_	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1608/1639	2.86	4.03	4.22	4.29	2.86
3. Did th	e exam qı	uestions reflect	t the e	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 ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1289/1583	3.71	4.02	4.19	4.31	3.71
				what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	1			1390/1532		3.80	4.01	4.07	3.17
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	2	0	2	2			1519/1612		4.01	4.16	4.18	3.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1087/1635	4.57	4.71	4.65	4.72	4.57
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1409/1579	3.29	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.29
		Lecture	e															
		uctor's lecture:			0	0	1	0	3	0	3		1408/1518		4.45	4.43	4.51	3.57
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	2	3		1414/1520		4.71	4.70	4.75	4.00
		_		explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	2			1453/1517		4.14	4.27	4.34	3.00
		es contribute to		-	0	0	1	2	0	3			1424/1550		4.18	4.22		3.14
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	864/1295	3.71	4.25	3.94	4.01	3.71
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	1		1207/1398		3.94	4.07	4.23	3.25
				ed to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	2		1146/1391		4.21	4.30	4.48	3.75
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00			4.24	4.28	4.50	4.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		3	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.55	3.93	4.24	3.00
		Semina																
	_	_		announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85		3.00	4.58	4.83	****
				lividual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82		4.50	4.52	4.49	****
	_	-		what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78		4.22	4.47	4.56	****
		ons contribute tor grading made			6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80 ****/ 82		3.33	4.47 4.16	4.59	****
J. MOIG G	1100114	ior grading mad	01001		-			-	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 02			1.10	1.02	
				Frequ	lency	DIS	trib	utioi	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					5						

Course-Section: GES 621 0101 University of Maryland

Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County Fall 2007 Instructor: REED, MARY LYNN (Instr. A)

I

0

3

Enrollment: 11

Ouestionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

								-	ncies	5	_		tructo		Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	- 5 	Mean	Raı	nk 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	3	1	6	0	3.30	1542/	1639	3.30	4.03	4.22	4.26	3.30
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1300/3	1397	3.40	4.04	4.28	4.37	3.40
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	1	1	5	1	1	3.00	1532/	1583	3.00	4.02	4.19	4.31	3.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	607/3	1532	4.22	3.80	4.01	4.10	4.22
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	4	0	4	1	0	2.22	1592/	1612	2.22	4.01	4.16	4.27	2.22
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/3	1635	4.78	4.71	4.65	4.81	4.78
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1318/	1579	3.40	4.00	4.08	4.17	3.40
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	947/	1518	3.60	4.45	4.43	4.49	3.60
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1338/	1520	4.20	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.20
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4			1199/				4.27		3.41
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	1	1	5			1077/3			4.18	4.22	4.23	3.70
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1101/	1295	3.55	4.25	3.94	3.95	3.55
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/3	1398	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.22	4.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	1		1			903/			4.21	4.30		4.14
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	1			944/				4.28		4.00
		echniques succe			3	4	0	1	1	0		3.33						4.01	
		Semina	r																
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	_	you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	80	****	3.33	4.47	4.50	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utio	n										
				_	-														
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 				Ту]	pe 			Majors 	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Grad	duat	е	6	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Unde	er-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	jh
				P 0									resp	pons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	

Other

Page 908

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: GES 621 0101 University of Maryland Page 909

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	Λ	3	1	5	3 90	1252/1639	3.90	4.40	4.27	4.42	3.90
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	1	6	0		1542/1639		4.03	4.22	4.26	3.30
		estions reflec			0	0	1	1	2	5	-		1300/1397		4.04	4.28	4.37	3.40
		ations reflect			1	0	1	1	5	1			1532/1583		4.02	4.19	4.31	3.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4		607/1532		3.80	4.01	4.10	4.22
				o what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	2		1303/1504		3.93	4.05	4.29	3.33
		system clearl			1	0	4	0	4	1	0		1592/1612		4.01	4.16	4.27	2.22
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	2	7		855/1635		4.71	4.65		4.78
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	2	2	4	2	0		1548/1579		4.00	4.08		3.40
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well 1	prepared	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	2.50	1504/1518	3.60	4.45	4.43	4.49	3.60
		ctor seem inter			0	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1485/1520		4.71	4.70	4.79	4.20
				xplained clearly	1	0	4	1	2	2	0	2.22	1508/1517		4.14	4.27	4.32	3.41
		es contribute t			0	1	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	1465/1550	3.70	4.18	4.22	4.23	3.70
				our understanding	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	3.55	4.25	3.94	3.95	3.55
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d 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 s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.55	3.93	4.01	3.33
		Semina	r															
4. Did pr	resentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.33	4.47	4.50	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5					or Ma			0	 Graduat		 6	Majo	·	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		Kec	quil!	eu I	OT MG	LJUL	>	U	Graduat	. C	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	G 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-	rad	4	Non-	major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GEI	пста	_				4	onder -g	ır au	1	INOII-	iia jui	Τ0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E14	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
JI aa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		11.0	CCCI	v C D				•	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					7	Tespons	CD LU L	c argi	ıııcaı		
				? 3		001												

Course-Section: GES 621 0101 University of Maryland
Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County

Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 910

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	cructor	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	Ο	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		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		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		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		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	Ο	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		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		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		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	Λ	2	2	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		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	U	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.55	3.93	4.01	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	J	-	U	_	_	U	_	3.33	7007 930	3.33	3.33	3.93	1.01	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	****
_			.,											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	3						

Course-Section: GES 622 0101 University of Maryland Title RES DESIGN/URBAN ENV Baltimore County

Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 911

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies						Inst	tructor	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 fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1303/1639	3.83	4.40	4.27	4.42	3.83
1 5	or make clear the ex		0	0	0	1	1	4	0		1481/1639	3.50	4.03	4.22	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the e	xpected 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 evalua	tions reflect the ex	pected 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 rea	dings 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 assi	gnments contribute t	o 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 expla	ined	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 w	as 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 gr	ade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	725/1579	4.10	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.10
1. Were the instruc	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	4	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.10	4.45	4.43	4.49	4.10
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested i	n 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 mate	erial presented and e	xplained 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 y	our 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 discus	sions 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 student	s actively encourage	d 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 instruct	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.24	4.28	4.49	4.80
4. Were special tec	•	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	682/ 958	3.60	3.55	3.93	4.01	3.60	
	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors		
CICCIES ECITICA	Cum. GPA	inpected drades				1000	AD0116	_			1 y j	20				

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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)

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	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		4.71	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	Ο	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CAMPBELL, PETYA

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.42	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.03	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.04	4.28	4.37	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.01	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.00
		Lectur																
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.49	5.00	
		ctor seem inter		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was le	ecture mat	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.00		
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.25	3.94	3.95	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.21	4.30	4.47	4.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.49	4.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Q.,		G GD3		Pour out of Courts				D -									20.	
Credits E	sarned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	asons	3 			Ту]	ре 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	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	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh	
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt			
				Ι 0	Other						0							
				? 0														

Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: JUNMEI, TANG (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 3

Fall 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 914

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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		1579/1639			4.22	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	1		1363/1397		4.04	4.28	4.37	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1010/1583			4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1486/1532		3.80	4.01	4.10	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1		1303/1504		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		4.22	4.47	4.52	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0		3.00	78/ 80		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		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		3.25	4.05	4.03	2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 42		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		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	4.51	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 43			4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0 1	1	0	1 1	0	3.00	27/ 32		3.44	4.37	4.31	3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Τ	U	Τ	U	0	Τ	0	2.50	20/ 21	2.50	3.00	4.52	4.42	2.50

Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: JUNMEI, TANG (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 3

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 914 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 3

JUNMEI, TANG (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 915 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	^	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1/1620	г оо	4 40	4 07	4 40	г оо
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0 1	0	0 1	0	3 1	5.00	1/1639 1579/1639		4.40	4.27	4.42 4.26	5.00 3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	1		1363/1397		4.03	4.22		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	•		0		-	-	_						4.37	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1 1	1 1	1		1010/1583		4.02	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1		1486/1532 1303/1504		3.80		4.10	
	0	0	0	0	2	-	_					4.05		3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1327/1612 1/1635		4.01 4.71	4.16 4.65	4.27 4.81	3.67 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		889/1579		4.71	4.05	4.81	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	009/13/9	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.1/	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		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		4.00	4.21	4.28	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion		U	U	U	1	U		4.00	J44/1300	4.00	1.21	1.20	1.10	1.00
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	4.52	4.74	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1		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
5. Note directia for grading made drear	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	_	1.00	15, 02	1.00	1.22	1.10	1.57	1.00
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	4.51	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 43		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		3.44	4.37	4.31	3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	, -	2.50	3.44	4.52	4.42	2.50
3. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	_	U	_	U	U	_	U	2.50	20/ 21	2.50	3.00	1.52	7.72	2.50

Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: JUNMEI, TANG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 3

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 915 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

ollment: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						