Course-Section: GES 102 0201
Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY
Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 903 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	109					
Questionnaires:	63		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnain

	Questions					377		_	ncie		-		ructor	Course	_			
		Questions	5 		NR 	NA	1 	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	L															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from	this course	0	0	1	2	16	16	28	4.08	1136/1649	4.13	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.08
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	2	2	6	22	31	4.24	920/1648	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.24
		uestions reflect			0	0	3	3	12	17	28		946/1375		4.38	4.27	4.10	4.02
		uations reflect			0	38	1	4	4	4	12		1213/1595		4.21	4.20	4.03	3.88
				hat you learned	3	1	5	8	12	22	12		1269/1533		3.88	4.04	3.87	3.47
		_		what you learned	2	47	2	1	4	2	5		****/1512		4.09	4.10	3.86	****
		g system clearly		ned	3	0	1	0	3	14	42	4.60			4.08	4.16	4.08	4.60
		was class cance			2	0	1	0	0	20	40		1103/1646		4.67	4.69		4.61
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	17	31	13	3.93	1016/1621	3.98	4.13	4.06	3.96	3.93
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			1	0	0	1	3	13	45	4.65	667/1568	4.70	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.65
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	1	3	13	45		1096/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	4.65
				plained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	24	31		812/1564		4.37	4.28	4.20	4.37
		es contribute to	_		2 5	0	0	2	3	20	36	4.48	736/1559		4.43	4.29	4.20	4.48
5. Did au	audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	2	1	12	14	28	4.14	599/1352	4.18	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.14
		Discuss																
				hat you learned	54	0	2	1	1	4	1		****/1384		3.95	4.08	3.86	****
				to participate	53	0	3	0	2	3	2		****/1382		4.20	4.29	4.03	****
				open discussion	54	0	2	0	1	4	2		****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		54	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	***	3.88	3.95	3.75	****
		Semina	£															
5. Were c	criteria 1	for grading made	e clear		60	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	***	3.40	3.68	3.54	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utic	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	ре			Majors	
00-27	00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 15						 quire	 ed f	or M	 Iaior	s 4	 !3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2
28-55						1.0	-1		- 1	)		-	or addac	-	-		_	-
56-83						Gei	nera:	L				8	Under-q	rad 6	3	Non-	major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 2									5				3	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h
	P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0 ? 1		Otl	her					6						
				; ±														

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 904 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	119						
Questionnaires:	86		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean		
		Question 																
		Genera	1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	17	34	34		1047/1649	4.13	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	12	29	43	4.31	825/1648	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.31
		uestions reflec			1	0	2	1	19	31	32	4.06	932/1375	4.04	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.06
		uations reflect			1	41	1	6	8	17	12		1285/1595		4.21	4.20	4.03	3.75
				what you learned	2	0	2	5	21	24	32	3.94	,		3.88	4.04	3.87	3.94
		_		what you learned	3	52 0	1	2	9 8	9	10		1089/1512		4.09	4.10	3.86 4.08	3.81
		g system clearl was class canc		inea	2	0	0	0	8	25 26	49 56	4.44	581/1623 1037/1646	4.52 4.63	4.08 4.67	4.16 4.69	4.08	4.44
	-			ning effectiveness	3 7	3	0	0	17	40	19	4.03	903/1621		4.13	4.06	3.96	4.03
9. HOW WO	Julu you	grade the overa	II teati	iiing effectiveness	,	3	U	U	Ι/	40	13	4.03	903/1021	3.90	4.13	4.00	3.90	4.03
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			6	0	0	0	4	12	64	4.75	480/1568	4.70	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.75
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	2	10	68	4.82	790/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	4.82
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	8	22	49	4.52	640/1564		4.37	4.28	4.20	4.52
		es contribute t			6	0	0	1	4	19	56	4.63	561/1559	4.55	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.63
5. Did at	ıdıovısua	l techniques en	our understanding	8	Τ	0	3	15	21	38	4.22	534/1352	4.18	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.22	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	76	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	****/1384	****	3.95	4.08	3.86	****
				d to participate	75	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.03	****
				d open discussion	76	0	0	1	0	1	8		****/1368		4.25	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		76	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****
		Self	Paced															
4. Was th	ne feedba	ck/tutoring by		s helpful	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	***	4.88	4.42	4.24	****
				P		- <b>D</b> .												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	ILIC	11									
Credits I	Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27	0-27 19 0.00-0.99 7 A 13						guire	ed f	or M	 lajor	s 5	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 47						-			-						3 -		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 8		Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 8	6	Non-	major	82
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 2														
Grad.							ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					9						
				? 1														

Course-Section: GES 110 0101

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Title

Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA

Enrollment: 131 Questionnaires: 39

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 905 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NΑ	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	14	8	11		1422/1649		4.35	4.28	4.11	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	10	4	19		1208/1648	4.14	4.20	4.23	4.16	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	8	7	20	4.16	875/1375	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	4	1	9	7	8		1406/1595	3.77	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3 2	8 8	3 5	2 4	8 9	3 5	12		1133/1533		3.88	4.04	3.87	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	6	8	6 20	4.22	1417/1512 861/1623	3.10 4.41	4.09 4.08	4.10 4.16	3.86 4.08	3.10 4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	1	10	23	20		1627/1646		4.08	4.16		3.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	4	1	1	12	12			1405/1621			4.06	3.96	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	-	_	_	12	12	_	3.11	1103/1021	3.03	1.15	1.00	3.50	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	5	10	18		1088/1568	4.61		4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	6	25		1133/1572	4.80	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	11	10	12		1154/1564	4.30	4.37	4.28	4.20	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	9	3	16		1252/1559	4.22	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	4	4	3	21	4.09	644/1352	4.40	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	8	4	5	2	4	2.57	1343/1384	3.13	3.95	4.08	3.86	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	5	3	9	3	4	2.92	1341/1382	3.49	4.20	4.29	4.03	2.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	5	3	6	4	5	3.04	1284/1368	3.67	4.25	4.30	4.01	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.03	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar			_		•	•	_				4 0.5			
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38 38	0	0 0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	4.97 4.20	4.43 4.35	4.39 4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.54	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	50	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 200		3.40	3.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	4.89	3.68	3.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: GES 110 0101
Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA

Enrollment: 131
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 905 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant .	
				I	0	Other	10	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 110 0201 University of Maryland Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: RABENHORST, THO Enrollment: 104

Questionnaires: 50

Page 906 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	-			
Ctudant	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	סמוכמו

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the i 3. Did the e 4. Did other 5. Did assig	General ain new insights, skills nstructor make clear the xam questions reflect th evaluations reflect the ned readings contribute en assignments contribut	e expected goals ne expected goals e expected goals to what you learned	1 1 1 0	0 0 0 33 7 43	1 0 0 0 4 0	4 0 1 1 4	5 7 5 4 6	11 17 14 4 14	28 25 29 7 15	3.74	975/1649 756/1648 617/1375 1032/1595 1074/1533 ****/1512	3.96 4.14 4.31 3.77 3.71 3.10	4.35 4.20 4.38 4.21 3.88 4.09	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10	4.11 4.16 4.10 4.03 3.87 3.86	4.24 4.37 4.45 4.06 3.74 ****
7. Was the g 8. How many	rading system clearly extimes was class cancelled you grade the overall the control of the contr	rplained ed	1 1 8	0 0 0	0 0	1 0 0	4 0 3	8 43 25	36 6 14	4.61 4.12	382/1623 1491/1646	4.41 3.89	4.08 4.67 4.13	4.16 4.69 4.06	4.08 4.67 3.96	4.61 4.12 4.26
2. Did the i 3. Was lectu 4. Did the l	instructor's lectures we nstructor seem interestere material presented are ectures contribute to what wisual techniques enhance.	ed in the subject nd explained clearly nat you learned	2 1 4 2 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 1 0	0 0 0 2 1	0 0 0 0 1	4 1 13 7 9	44 48 32 38 36	4.92 4.98 4.63 4.65 4.70	220/1568 178/1572 511/1564 536/1559 182/1352	4.61 4.80 4.30 4.22 4.40	4.55 4.84 4.37 4.43 4.26	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.20 4.20 3.86	4.92 4.98 4.63 4.65 4.70
<ol> <li>Were all</li> <li>Did the i</li> </ol>	Discussion discussions contribute students actively encour nstructor encourage fair ial techniques successfu	to what you learned raged to participate and open discussion	34 32 33 31	0 0 0 14	2 1 0 2	2 1 1 0	1 3 3 1	5 4 3 1	6 9 10 1	4.06 4.29	1002/1384 934/1382 821/1368 ****/ 948	3.13 3.49 3.67 ****	3.95 4.20 4.25 3.88	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	3.86 4.03 4.01 3.75	3.69 4.06 4.29 ****
2. Were you	Laboratory provided with adequate b		49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.08	****
4. Did prese	Seminar gned topics relevant to ntations contribute to w eria for grading made cl	what you learned	49 49 49	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00	****/ 88 ****/ 92 ****/ 288	*** *** ***	4.97 4.20 3.40	4.54 4.35 3.68	4.31 4.01 3.54	* * * * * * * * * * * *
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib											
Credits Earn	ed Cum. GPA3 0.00-0.99 0	Expected Grades A 14		 Do		Rea  ed fo	ason 				Ty  Graduat		0	Majo	Majors	1
28-55 56-83 84-150	28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 20 56-83 8 2.00-2.99 4 C 7						OT IN	10 ر ما	2 ن	5	Under-g	rad 5	0	Non-	major	49
Grau.	0 3.50-4.00 10	F 1 P 0 I 0 ? 1			ecti <sup>,</sup> her	ves				9	#### respons				_	11

Course-Section: GES 120 0101

ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI

Title Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE

Enrollment: 150 Questionnaires: 96

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 907 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanse	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	9	21	59	4.53	603/1649	4.53	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	3	9	22	55	4.45	643/1648	4.45	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	3	6	22	57	4.47	581/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	60	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	672/1595	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.03	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	15	12	3	16	15	26	3.56	1214/1533	3.56	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	71	0	0	6	2	10	4.22	****/1512	****	4.09	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	7	21	60	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	1	6	80	4.91	664/1646	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	1	0	6	30	35	4.36	559/1621	4.36	4.13	4.06	3.96	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	0	0	11	73	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	3	82	4.96	237/1572	4.96	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	7	16	62	4.62	537/1564	4.62	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	5	78	4.87	238/1559	4.87	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	2	12	26	43	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.26	3.98	3.86	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	4	4	8	9	19	3.80	942/1384	3.80	3.95	4.08	3.86	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	2	14	9	21	4.07	932/1382	4.07	4.20	4.29	4.03	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	1	2	8	11	22	4.16	896/1368	4.16	4.25	4.30	4.01	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	51	36	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	5	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	92	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	3	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.14	****
Quantiza de la companya de la compa														
Seminar	0.0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 88	****	4 07	4 54	1 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89 90	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.97 4.68	$4.54 \\ 4.47$	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	90	3	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.47	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	90	3	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 92	****	4.20	4.43	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	90	3	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 288	***	3.40	3.68	3.54	****
ma and a wards														
Field Work	0.1	0	2	0	0	0	2	2 40	****/ 「つ	****	4 05	1 06	2 77	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	91	0	2	0	-	0	3	3.10	****/ 52 ****/ 48	****	4.95	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	91	0 2	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 48 ****/ 39	****	4.59	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91					1	2	0,	, 55		4.60	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	91	3	0	0	0 2	1	1		****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	90	3	U	U	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 312	***	4.89	3.68	3.51	* * * *
Self Paced		_	_				_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	91	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	90	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	90	3	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	90	3	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	90	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: GES 120 0101

Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI

Instructor:

PARKER, EUGENE 150

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 96 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 907 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	32						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General	7	Under-grad	96	Non-major	94
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				?	5						

Course-Section: GES 220 0101 University of Maryland Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: READEL, KARIN

Enrollment: 23

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 908

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 16 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 3 13 4.81 265/1649 4.81 4.35 4.28 4.29 4.81 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 336/1648 4.69 4.20 4.23 4.25 4.69 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 11 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 296/1375 4.75 4.38 4.27 4.37 4.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 0 6 7 4.36 697/1595 4.36 4.21 4.20 4.22 4.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 2 0 1 5 3 3.64 1159/1533 3.64 3.88 4.04 4.04 3.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1062/1512 3.85 4.09 4.10 4.14 3.85 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 437/1623 4.56 4.08 4.16 4.21 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 3 13 4.81 816/1646 4.81 4.67 4.69 4.63 4.81 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 234/1621 4.67 4.13 4.06 4.01 4.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 7 8 4.53 815/1568 4.53 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.73 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 406/1564 4.71 4.37 4.28 4.27 4.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 261/1559 4.86 4.43 4.29 4.33 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6 1 0 1 3 3 3.88 836/1352 3.88 4.26 3.98 4.07 3.88 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 326/1384 4.67 3.95 4.08 3.99 4.67 2 7 4.78 373/1382 4.78 4.20 4.29 4.19 4.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 522/1368 4.67 4.25 4.30 4.21 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful 7 3 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 310/948 4.33 3.88 3.95 3.89 4.33 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93 14/ 221 4.93 4.78 4.16 4.45 4.93 2. Were you provided with adequate background information  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 3 \quad 12 \quad 4.80$ 27/ 243 4.80 4.54 4.12 4.47 4.80 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93 19/ 212 4.93 4.69 4.40 4.62 4.93 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93 21/ 209 4.93 4.77 4.35 4.64 4.93

#### Frequency Distribution

1 1 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 285/555 4.57 4.65 4.29 4.33 4.57

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				2	1						

Course-Section: GES 286 0101

EXPL ENV: GEO-SPAT VIE

Title Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 909 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	0	0	4	17	4.81	274/1649	4.81		4.28	4.29	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	855/1375	4.19	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.21	4.20	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1533	****	3.88	4.04	4.04	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	619/1621	4.32	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	461/1568	4.76	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	854/1564	4.33		4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52			4.43	4.29	4.33	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	240/1352		4.26	3.98		4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	976/1384		3.95	4.08	3.99	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	757/1382	4.36	4.20	4.29	4.19	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	601/1368	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.21	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	28/ 221	4.78	4.78	4.16	4.45	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	61/ 243	4.56	4.54	4.12	4.47	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	32/ 212	4.89	4.69	4.40	4.62	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 209		4.77	4.35		5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	311/ 555		4.65	4.29		4.44
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.97	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	,	****	4.68	4.47	3.75	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00		****	4.00	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 92	****	4.20	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 288	***	3.40	3.68	3.65	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	Ι/	_	U	U	1	1	_	1.00	/ 200		3.40	3.00	3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	19/ 52	4.91	4.95	4.06	3.93	4.91
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	22/ 48	4.18	4.59	4.09	4.05	4.18
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	15/ 39	4.80	4.60	4.47	4.49	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	16/ 39	4.80	4.90	4.38	3.66	4.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	12/ 312	4.78	4.89	3.68	3.59	4.78
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	,	****	4.81	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	***
1 Suddies		Ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	-	_	-	1.25	, 110			2.22	J., L	

Course-Section: GES 286 0101

Title EXPL ENV: GEO-SPAT VIE

Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 909 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 308 0101 University of Maryland Title ECOLOGY SWAN, CHRIS Instructor:

58

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 50

Page 910 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 .1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	3	14	32	4.54	590/1649	4.54	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.54
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	19	28	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.50
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	19	29	4.54	513/1375	4.54	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.54
		ations reflect			0	11	0	0	3	11	25	4.56	428/1595	4.56	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.56
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	5	8	9	6	12	10	3.16	1404/1533	3.16	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.16
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments conti	ribute t	o what you learned	0	34	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.50
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	6	7	37	4.62	370/1623	4.62	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.62
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		3	0	0	1	0	29	17	4.32	1356/1646	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.32
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	all teac	thing effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	19	20	4.47	415/1621	4.48	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.47
1. Were t	the instru	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	45	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.88		
2. Did th						0	0	0	3	3	42	4.81	815/1572	4.81	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.81
3. Was le						0	0	0	5	13	30	4.52	630/1564	4.52	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.52
4. Did th	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	10	37	4.69	475/1559	4.69	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.69
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					4	2	1	2	9	28	4.43	379/1352	4.43	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.43
		Discus	ssion															
				what you learned	30	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	840/1384	3.95	3.95	4.08	4.11	3.95
				ed to participate	30	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	757/1382	4.35	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.35
		_		nd open discussion	30	0	2	0	3		14		844/1368		4.25	4.30	4.39	4.25
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	essful		30	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	***	3.88	3.95	4.00	****
		Semina	ar															
1. Were a	assigned t	copics relevant	t to the	e announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	***	4.97	4.54	4.63	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27							quire	ea io	or M	ajor	S	U	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	•	B 21 C 15		Q	7	1				2	TTm d a se		^	Mar		4.4		
56-83 84-150	13 9	D 0		Ger	neral	L				3	Under-g	rau 5	0	NON-	major	44		
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	8 11	D 0 F 0		רק.	ectiv	700				1	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	тт	P 0		БТ	=C L I \	765				_	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	ner				Δ	2	respons	CD LO L	c argii	ıııcaı.	10	
				? 1		OCI	LCL				7							
				; ±														

Course-Section: GES 311 0101 University of Maryland Title WEATHER AND CLIMATE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: MEHTA, AMITA Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 911 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  0 0 1 5 8 12 9 3.66 1436/1649 3.66 4.35 4.28 4.27 3.6  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  0 0 0 5 7 16 7 3.71 1375/1648 3.71 4.20 4.23 4.18 3.7  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0 0 0 3 2 15 15 4.20 855/1375 4.20 4.38 4.27 4.22 4.2  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  0 4 0 3 6 12 10 3.94 1161/1595 3.94 4.21 4.20 4.21 3.9  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1 3 2 5 3 13 8 3.65 1153/1533 3.65 3.88 4.04 4.05 3.6  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1 0 3 4 5 14 8 3.59 1214/1512 3.59 4.09 4.10 4.11 3.5  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  1 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8  8. How many times was class cancelled  1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.9  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 5 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7  4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2 0 2 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7  5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2 1 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2 1 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ****  Self Paced					Fre	_	ncie	s			tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 5 8 12 9 3.66 1436/1649 3.66 4.35 4.28 4.27 3.6 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 5 7 16 7 3.71 1375/1648 3.71 4.20 4.23 4.18 3.7 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 2 15 15 4.20 855/1375 4.20 4.38 4.27 4.22 4.24 4.25 4.36 1.25 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.21 4.20 4.21 4.20 4.21 4.20 4.21 4.20 4.21 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 3 6 12 10 3.94 1161/1595 3.94 4.21 4.20 4.21 3.9 5 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 2 5 3 13 8 3.65 1153/1533 3.65 3.88 4.04 4.05 3.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 4 5 14 8 3.59 1214/1512 3.59 4.09 4.10 4.11 3.5 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.99 8.	Question	S	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 5 7 16 7 3.71 1375/1648 3.71 4.20 4.23 4.18 3.7 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 2 15 15 4.20 855/1375 4.20 4.38 4.27 4.22 4.2 4.2	Genera	 1														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 2 15 15 4.20 855/1375 4.20 4.38 4.27 4.22 4.2   4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 3 6 12 10 3.94 1161/1595 3.94 4.21 4.20 4.21 3.9   5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 2 5 3 13 8 3.65 1153/1533 3.65 3.88 4.04 4.05 3.6   6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 4 5 14 8 3.59 1214/1512 3.59 4.09 4.10 4.11 3.5   7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8   8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.99   9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 5 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3    Lecture   1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.77   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0    Discussion   1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6   4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	1. Did you gain new insights, ski	lls from this course	0	0	1	5	8	12	9	3.66	1436/1649	3.66	4.35	4.28	4.27	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 3 6 12 10 3.94 1161/1595 3.94 4.21 4.20 4.21 3.9 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 2 5 3 13 8 3.65 1153/1533 3.65 3.88 4.04 4.05 3.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 4 5 14 8 3.59 1214/1512 3.59 4.09 4.10 4.11 3.5 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.9 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 5 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3    Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7    Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	2. Did the instructor make clear	the expected goals	0	0	0	5	7	16	7	3.71	1375/1648	3.71	4.20	4.23	4.18	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 2 5 3 13 8 3.65 1153/1533 3.65 3.88 4.04 4.05 3.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 4 5 14 8 3.59 1214/1512 3.59 4.09 4.10 4.11 3.5 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.9 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 5 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6   4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	3. Did the exam questions reflect	t the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	15	15	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 4 5 14 8 3.59 1214/1512 3.59 4.09 4.10 4.11 3.5 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.9 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 5 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6   4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ****	4. Did other evaluations reflect	the expected goals	0	4	0	3	6	12	10	3.94	1161/1595	3.94	4.21	4.20	4.21	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 10 10 11 3.82 1228/1623 3.82 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.9 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 5 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1 2.01   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6   4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	5. Did assigned readings contrib	ute to what you learned	1	3	2	5	3	13	8	3.65	1153/1533	3.65	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 31 4.91 597/1646 4.91 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.99 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 5 8 8 8 3 3.38 1415/1621 3.38 4.13 4.06 4.02 3.3  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.64 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***  Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.11 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	6. Did written assignments contr	ibute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	5	14	8	3.59	1214/1512	3.59	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.59
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Dia audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.64  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ****	7. Was the grading system clearl	y explained	1	0	1	2	10	10	11	3.82	1228/1623	3.82	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.82
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8. How many times was class cand	elled	1	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	597/1646	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.91
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 6 10 15 4.12 1220/1568 4.12 4.55 4.43 4.39 4.1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.7 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	9. How would you grade the overa	ll teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	5	8	8	3	3.38	1415/1621	3.38	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 4 27 4.76 931/1572 4.76 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.73   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.74   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.75   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.00    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6   4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	Lectur	e														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 2 9 10 10 3.73 1311/1564 3.73 4.37 4.28 4.25 3.7 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	1. Were the instructor's lecture	s well prepared	2	0	1	1	6	10	15	4.12	1220/1568	4.12	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 5 9 12 3.73 1295/1559 3.73 4.43 4.29 4.23 3.7 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 2 2 3 7 13 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 3.97 4.0 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	2. Did the instructor seem inter	ested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	931/1572	4.76	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.76
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.64  4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	3. Was lecture material presente	d and explained clearly	2	0			9	10	10	3.73	1311/1564	3.73	4.37	4.28	4.25	3.73
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6  4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	4. Did the lectures contribute t	o what you learned	2	0	2	5	5	9	12	3.73	1295/1559	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.73
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 1 5 2 2 2.79 1317/1384 2.79 3.95 4.08 4.11 2.7 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	5. Did audiovisual techniques en	hance your understanding	5	3	2	2	3	7	13	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 2 1 3 7 3.93 1014/1382 3.93 4.20 4.29 4.37 3.9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	Discus	sion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 2 3 2 5 3.62 1140/1368 3.62 4.25 4.30 4.39 3.6 4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	1. Did class discussions contrib	ute to what you learned	21	0	4	1	5	2	2	2.79	1317/1384	2.79	3.95	4.08	4.11	2.79
4. Were special techniques successful 21 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.00 ***  Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	2. Were all students actively en	couraged to participate	21	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1014/1382	3.93	4.20	4.29	4.37	3.93
Self Paced  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	3. Did the instructor encourage	fair and open discussion	22	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1140/1368	3.62	4.25	4.30	4.39	3.62
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.63 4.43 5.00 ***	4. Were special techniques succe	ssful	21	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.00	****
	Self	Paced														
Frequency Distribution	3. Were your contacts with the i	nstructor helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	5.00	****
riequency Distribution		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	35	Non-major	26
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 313 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOGEOGRAPHY Baltimore County Instructor: LEWIS, LAURA Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 912
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 29
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rar		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 General																	
1 Did voi	ı dəin ne	w insights,skill	la from this con	rge	0	0	0	0	5	8	16	4.38	816/1	649	4.38	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.38
_	_	tor make clear t			0	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	825/1		4.31	4.20	4.23	4.18	4.31
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	334/1		4.72	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.72
	_	ations reflect			2	0	0	2	4	9		4.15	956/1		4.15	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.15
					0	0	1	5	6	9	8		1166/1			3.88	4.04	4.05	3.62
		adings contribut													3.62				
		signments contrib		learned	0	0	2	1	7	9	10		1075/1		3.83	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.83
		system clearly	-		0	0	0	0		10		4.45	581/1		4.45	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.45
	-	was class cance			0	1	0	0	3	15	10		1398/1		4.25	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overall	l teaching effec	tiveness	7	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	720/1	L621	4.23	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.23
		Lecture																	
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared		0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	755/1	1568	4.59	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.59
		tor seem interes		ect	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	790/1	1572	4.83	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.83
		erial presented	-		0	0	0	1	6	14	8		1127/1		4.00	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.00
		s contribute to			0	0	0	3	4	4		4.28	952/1		4.28	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.28
		techniques enha			0	1	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	515/1		4.25	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.25
J. Dia dae	110115441	canaing	Ü	-	J	2	-	,	13	1.23	313/1		1.23	1.20	3.70	3.77	1.25		
		Discuss																	
1. Did cla			17	0	0	0	4	3		4.08	767/1		4.08	3.95	4.08	4.11	4.08		
2. Were al			17	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1	1382	4.75	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.75		
3. Did the	e instruc	cussion	17	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	594/1	L368	4.58	4.25	4.30	4.39	4.58		
4. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus Nere special techniques successful						0	1	2	1	4	4.00	431/	948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.00	4.00
		Laborato	orv																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understand	-	rial	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	221	****	4.78	4.16	4.07	****
		led with adequate			27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/		****	4.54	4.12	3.89	****
		materials availa			28	0	0	0	0	0	1			212	****	4.69	4.40	4.21	****
	_	structor provide		IVICICE	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	4.77	4.35	4.12	****
		its for lab repor		ified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		***	4.65	4.29	4.22	****
1		Seminar		4-1	0.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/	0.0	****	4 07	4 54	4 62	****
	_	opics relevant t			28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	88		4.97	4.54	4.63	****
		tor available for			28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	4.68	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did res	search pr	rojects contribut	te to what you I	earned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	81	****	4.97	4.43	4.30	****
		Self Pa	aced																
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contribut	te to what you l	earned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	4.90	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did stu	ıdy quest	ions make clear	the expected go	al	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	4.81	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were vo	our conta	cts with the ins	structor helpful		28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	41	****	4.63	4.43	5.00	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful						0	0	0	0	1		****/	24	***	4.88		5.00	****
							ribu	utior	ı										
a 1'. =	,	Cum. GPA	1 0 1				_						_				'		
Credits Ea	arned 	d Grades				Rea	asons	3 				Ту <u>г</u>	pe 			Majors			
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Grad	duate	2	0	Majo	r	7
28-55																			
56-83	83 2 2.00-2.99 4 C 2						neral	1				5	Unde	er-gi	cad 2	9	Non-	major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4 D	0											_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F	0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1			Means t es to b			_	n
			I	0		Ot.h	ner				2.	0	rest	OIISE	a co L	e sign	ıııcal		
			0		001					_	-								

0

Course-Section: GES 329 0101

Title GEOG OF DISEASE & HEAL

Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 34

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 913 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Cours	e 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	2	2	7	23	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	23	4.56	498/1648			4.23	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	22	4.56	505/1375			4.27	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	1	5	24	4.53	462/1595			4.20	4.21	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	23	4.44	432/1533			4.04	4.05	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	21	4.55	352/1512			4.10	4.11	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	6	22	4.53	469/1623			4.16	4.08	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	266/1646			4.69	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	676/1621			4.06		4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	26	4.72	554/1568	4.72	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	591/1572			4.70	4.64	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	26	4.74	358/1564			4.28	4.25	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	499/1559			4.29	4.23	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	4	2	23	4.45	351/1352			3.98	3.97	4.45
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your diderstanding	3	U	1		-	2	23	1.13	331/1332	4.45	4.20	3.90	3.97	1.13
Discussion	16	0	0	1	2	3	1.0	1 11	400/1204	1 11	2 05	1 00	1 11	1 11
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16 16	0	0	0	0	4	12 14	4.44	499/1384 373/1382		3.95 4.20	4.08	4.11	4.44 4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	17		,					
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16		0	0	3			4.94	158/1368			4.30	4.39	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	U	U	3	6	7	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.88	3.95	4.00	4.25
Seminar	2.0	-	0	0	0	•		F 00	****	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 = 4	4 62	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88		4.97	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85		4.68	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81		4.97	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92		4.20	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.58	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.81	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.63	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.88	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7											 0			17
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 1 B 16		ке	quir	ed fo	יד ואו	ajor	D	5	Graduat	C	U	Majo	)T	Τ/
		00	nera	1			1	.0	IIndom	rad	2.4	N™o∽	mo dosc	17
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 6 C 6 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 9 D 0		Gel	nera.	Т			1	· U	Under-g	rau .	34	NOII-	-major	Ι/
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		. רים	ecti	.,,,,,				0	#### -	Meana	there s	ro not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		E16	ECLI,	ves				U					_	111
I 0		O+1	hom				1	.8	respons	es LO I	be sign	ıııcar	IL	
I U		OE	her				1	.0						

Course-Section: GES 342 0101 Title METROPOLITAN BALTIMORE

Baltimore County

1

BENNETT, SARI J Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 26 University of Maryland Page 914 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		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 cain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.64
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	5	7	12	4.20	966/1648		4.20	4.23	4.18	4.20
		uestions reflec		1 3	1	0	1	2	2	3	17	4.32			4.38	4.27	4.22	4.3
		uations reflect			1	3	1	2	3	6	10		1067/1595		4.21	4.20	4.21	4.0
				what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	584/1533		3.88	4.04	4.05	4.2
	_	-		o what you learned	1	12	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	849/1512	4.08	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.0
		g system clearl			1	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	915/1623		4.08	4.16	4.08	4.1
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.8
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	10	6	3.87	1096/1621	3.87	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.8
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	667/1568	4.64	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.6		
2. Did th	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.7
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	1109/1564	4.04	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.0
1. Did th	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36			4.43	4.29	4.23	4.3
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					1	2	1	6	5	9	3.78	893/1352	3.78	4.26	3.98	3.97	3.7
		Discus																
				what you learned	12	0	0	2	4	3		3.79	948/1384		3.95	4.08	4.11	3.79
				ed to participate	12	0	0	2	2	3		4.07			4.20	4.29	4.37	4.0
				nd open discussion	11	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	948/1368		4.25	4.30	4.39	4.0
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		11	9	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 948	****	3.88	3.95	4.00	***
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.22	***
_		Semina								_								
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear		24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.58	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27							quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s	3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	2	в 6						-										
56-83	2	C 5		Gei	nera:	1				9	Under-g	rad 2	16	Non-	-major	17		
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 2														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	јh
				P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						

University of Maryland Page 915
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: GES 381 0101

REMOTE SENSING

RABENHORST, THO

Title

Instructor:

-																	
						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	Mean
		General															
_		ew insights, skills fr		1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	395/1649		4.35	4.28	4.27	4.70
		ctor make clear the e	_	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	839/1648		4.20	4.23	4.18	4.30
	_	estions reflect the		1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	915/1375		4.38	4.27	4.22	4.10
		ations reflect the e	_	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	,		4.21	4.20	4.21	4.44
		eadings contribute to	_	2	3	0	2	2	1	1		1400/1533		3.88	4.04	4.05	3.17
		signments contribute	_	1	2	1	0	0	2	5	4.25			4.09	4.10	4.11	4.25
	-	system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	,		4.08	4.16	4.08	4.20
	-	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	10	0		1544/1646		4.67	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	720/1621	4.22	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.22
		Lecture															
1 Word +1	ho inatm		nanawad	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	E 00	1 /1 5 6 0	E 00	/ EE	1 12	1 20	E 00
		ctor's lectures well		1					0	10	5.00	1/1568		4.55	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem interested	_	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	4.90
		erial presented and	= =	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	651/1564		4.37	4.28	4.25	4.50
		es contribute to what	-	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	586/1559		4.43	4.29	4.23	4.60
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.60
		Discussion															
1 Did al	aga diga	ussions contribute to	what was learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2 50	1346/1384	2.50	3.95	4.08	4.11	2.50
			_	7	0	0	1	2	0	1		1275/1382		4.20	4.29	4.37	3.25
			7	-	-		1	_									
	re all students actively encouraged to participa d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss re special techniques successful				0 1	1 0	0 1	0	2	0		1286/1368		4.25	4.30	4.39	3.00
4. were sp	peciai te	echniques successiui		7	1	U	Т	U	1	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	3.88	3.95	4.00	3.67
		Laboratory															
1 Did the	a lah ind	rease understanding	of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.78	4.16	4.07	4.50
		led with adequate bac		7	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	210/ 243		4.54	4.12	3.89	3.50
_	_	materials available	_	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	188/ 212		4.69	4.40	4.21	3.75
	_	structor provide assi		7	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75			4.77	4.35	4.12	3.75
		its for lab reports o		7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.65		4.12	4.67
J. WEIE I	equiremen	ics for tab reports c	rearry specified	,	1	U	U	U		2	4.07	272/ 333	1.07	4.05	1.27	7.22	1.07
		Seminar															
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available for in	dividual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.68	4.47	4.55	****
		ojects contribute to		10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,		4.97	4.43	4.30	****
	_	ons contribute to wha	=	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.20	4.35	4.46	****
		for grading made clea		10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288		3.40	3.68	3.58	****
3. MG10 01		or grading made orda			Ü	Ū	Ū	Ū	_	Ū	1.00	, 200		3.10	3.00	3.30	
		Field Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	cience contribute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	***	4.95	4.06	3.59	****
	_	understand your eva	_	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	4.21	****
_	_	ctor available for co		10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00			4.60	4.47	4.43	****
		could you discuss yo		10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00			4.90	4.38	4.32	****
	_	s help you carry out		9	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 312		4.89	3.68	3.60	****
J. Dia coi	iii ci ciicci	neip you early out	ricia accivicies		Ü	o	o	_	_	O	3.30	, 312		1.05	3.00	3.00	
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 4				_						_				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0								•						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	nere a	re not	enoug	ın

P 0

I 0 Other 9 ? 0

Course-Section: GES 386 0101 University of Maryland Title

INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 916 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	7	3	5	3.87	1303/1649	3.87	4.35	4.28	4.27	3.87
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	4	7	2		1471/1648	3.53	4.20	4.23	4.18	3.53
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	,	4.07	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.07
		uations reflect			0	0	0	2	3	8	2		1335/1595	3.67	4.21	4.20	4.21	3.67
				what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	1	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.20	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.20
				o what you learned	0	6	0	2	5	2	0	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.00
		g system clearl			0	0	1	5	1	4	4	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.33
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1399/1621	3.42	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.42
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.80
2. Did the						0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	967/1572	4.73	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.73
						0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1360/1564	3.60	4.37	4.28	4.25	3.60
4. Did the	s lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1322/1559	3.67	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.67
5. Did aud	oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					1	1	1	0	7	5	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	3.97	4.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	1372/1384	1.75	3.95	4.08	4.11	1.75
				d to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1382	****	4.20	4.29	4.37	***
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1368	****	4.25	4.30	4.39	****
		Labora	_															
		crease understa			12	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.07	****
				ground information	12	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 243	****	4.54	4.12	3.89	****
				or lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.21	****
		structor provid			12	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.22	****
F Did		Field N			1.1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 210	***	4 00	2 (0	2 60	***
5. DIG COL	nrerences	s neip you carr	y out I	ield activities	14	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 312		4.89	3.68	3.60	
				Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$	
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	8
28-55	1.00-1.99 0 B 7															_		
56-83	1 1.00 1.77 0 2 .					Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	ner				1	2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: GES 400B 0101 University of Maryland Title POPULATION GEOGRAPHY Baltimore County Instructor: RATCLIFFE, MICH Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

11

University of Maryland Page 917
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		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. Di	d vou gain r	new insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.60
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1648	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.44
		questions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1375	4.89	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.89
		uations reflect			2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	150/1595	4.88	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.88
		eadings contrib			2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.00
6. Di	d written as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	723/1512	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.22
7. Wa	s the gradir	ng system clearl	y explai	ined	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.78
8. Ho	w many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.50
9. Ho	w would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.50
		Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject																
1 1/10	wo the insta		womawad	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.55	4.43	1 = 1	4.40	
			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.43	4.79	5.00		
			0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.37	4.70	4.40	4.60		
			0	0	0	0	0	3	7		475/1559	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.40			
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear oid the lectures contribute to what you learned oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	0	0	0	3	6	4.70	208/1352			3.98	4.41	
э. Д	d audiovisua	ii teciniiques en	nance yo	our understanding	0	Τ.	U	U	U	3	0	4.07	200/1352	4.07	4.20	3.90	4.07	4.07
		Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class disc	cussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	376/1384	4.60	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.60
2. We	re all stude	ents actively en	courageo	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Di	d the instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.80
4. We	re special t	echniques succe	ssful	_	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.67
				P		- <b>-</b>			_									
				Frequ	iency	DIST	tribi	ıtıor	1									
Credi	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-2	7 0	A 9		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r r	8		
28-5	-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						-			,								
56-8	83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0					Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	2
84-1	50 5	D 0									_				-			
Grad		F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h		
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Otl	her					7	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: GES 400H 0101 University of Maryland Page 918 Title NEGOT OF WATER RES DIS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RIVERA, MEGAN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

	-			
Ctudant	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	סמוכמו

			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	3	9	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.88	4.04	4.14	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1371/1623	3.55	4.08	4.16	4.27	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1121/1646	4.58	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	766/1621	4.18	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	389/1352	4.42	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.20	4.29	4.56	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.50
	_	_	-	-	-	_	_		,	,				

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0	) Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad 12	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	nere are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to be	significant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	_	
				?	1					

Course-Section: GES 408 0101 University of Maryland Title FIELD ECOLOGY Baltimore County Fall 2008

SWAN, CHRIS Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Page 919 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vou	gain new			m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.62	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.62
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	427/1648		4.20	4.23	4.36	4.62
				xpected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	521/1375	4.54	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.54
	_	tions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	462/1595	4.54	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.54
5. Did ass	signed read	dings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	895/1533	3.92	3.88	4.04	4.14	3.92
6. Did wri	tten assi	gnments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	627/1512	4.31	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.31
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	469/1623	4.54	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.54
	-	as class canc			0	0	0	0	0	10	3		1412/1646		4.67	4.69	4.71	4.23
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	261/1621	4.64	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.64
		Lectur	_															
		tor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568		4.55	4.43	4.54	4.82
				n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.91
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/1564	4.64	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.64
		contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	549/1559		4.43	4.29	4.41	4.64
5. Did aud	liovisual	tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	227/1352	4.64	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.64
		Discus																
		what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384		3.95	4.08	4.35	4.80		
		_	_	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382		4.20	4.29	4.56	4.90
		d open discussion	3	0 1	0	0 1	1	2	7 4	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.25	4.30	4.58	4.60		
4. Were sp	eciai tec.		4	Τ	U	Т	U	3	4	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.25		
		Labora	tory															
			_	f the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	36/ 221	4.73	4.78	4.16	4.73	4.73
				ground information	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	40/ 243	4.73	4.54	4.12	4.61	4.73
				or lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	74/ 212		4.69	4.40	4.57	4.73
		ructor provid			2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	57/ 209		4.77	4.35	4.63	4.73
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	260/ 555	4.73	4.65	4.29	4.41	4.73
		Field																
	_			hat you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	4.86	****
_	_	_		uation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 48	****	4.59	4.09	4.42	****
		or available			11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39 ****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****
	_	_	_	r evaluations ield activities	10 10	0	0	0	0	1 1	2		****/ 39 ****/ 312		4.90 4.89	4.38	4.59 3.95	****
5. Dia con	iterences .	neip you carr	y out I	ieid activities	10	U	U	U	U	1	۷	4.07	/ 312		4.09	3.00	3.95	
			Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n										
Credits Ea	ırned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors			
00-27							uire	ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3										-	-	) (		_
56-83							nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h		
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					9						
				? 0														

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

12

Course-Section: GES 416 0101 University of Maryland Page 920 HYDROLOGY FEB 11, 2009 MILLER, ANDREW Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	161/1648	4.89	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.89
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1375	4.89	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.89
		uations reflect			0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.57
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/1533	4.33	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.33
		_		o what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.67
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	6		321/1623	4.67	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	7	2		1419/1646	4.22	4.67	4.69	4.71	
9. How wor	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1621	4.78	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.78
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.89	
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00		
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	- ,	4.89	4.37	4.28	4.40	4.89
		es contribute t		•	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.26	3.98	4.07	4.33
		D!																
1 544 -1		Discus		3	7	0	0	0	0	^	_	F 00	4444/1204	****	2 05	4 00	4 25	****
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1384 ****/1382	****	3.95 4.20	4.08	4.35	****
				d to participate d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1368	****	4.20	4.29	4.58	****
				d open discussion	7 7	1	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 948			3.95	4.58	****
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSIUI		/	1	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/ 948		3.88	3.95	4.31	* * * *
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27							quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4										_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: GES 451 0101

Title URBAN SUSTAINABILITY

Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2008

Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 921

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	S
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 	3 	-4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	M
General														
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.35	4.28	4.50	4
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	825/1648	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.36	4
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.48	*
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	150/1595	4.88	4.21	4.20	4.36	4
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	180/1533	4.75	3.88	4.04	4.14	4
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	436/1512	4.47	4.09	4.10	4.26	4
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	370/1623	4.63	4.08	4.16	4.27	4
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0		13	4.81	816/1646	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	497/1621	4.42	4.13	4.06	4.24	4
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	779/1568	4.56	4.55	4.43	4.54	4
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1572	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.79	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	620/1564	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.40	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	629/1559	4.56	4.43	4.29	4.41	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.07	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	175/1384	4.86	3.95	4.08	4.35	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	292/1382	4.86	4.20	4.29	4.56	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	211/1368	4.93	4.25	4.30	4.58	
Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	3.88	3.95	4.31	
Laboratory														
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.65	4.29	4.41	
Seminar														
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	31/ 88	4.87	4.97	4.54	4.66	
Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	32/ 85	4.73	4.68	4.47	4.54	
Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	26/ 81	4.80	4.97	4.43	4.57	
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	39/ 92	4.53	4.20	4.35	4.44	
Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	52/ 288	4.40	3.40	3.68	3.71	
Field Work														
Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.95	
Self Paced	_	_	_	_	_		_	4	02 / 55	4	4 00	4 0 0	4	
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	23/ 53	4.69	4.90	4.30	4.64	
Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	4	0	0	1	3		4.44	12/ 30		4.81		4.24	
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	1	0	0	3	3		4.25	27/ 41		4.63		4.84	
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	9	0	0		1		4.75	13/ 24		4.88		4.85	
Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3

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

I 0 Other 10 ?

Course-Section: GES 481 0101

Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 922

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions				Fre	emiei	ncies	3		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	I.evel	Sect
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  0 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.33 871/1649 4.33 4.35 4.28 4.50 4.2  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  0 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 931/1648 4.22 4.20 4.23 4.36 4.2  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 617/1375 4.44 4.38 4.27 4.48 4.4  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4 4.33 722/1595 4.33 4.21 4.20 4.36 4.2  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0 0 2 0 1 2 4 3.67 1139/1533 3.67 3.88 4.04 4.14 3.6  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 1055/1512 3.86 4.09 4.10 4.26 3.8  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.08 4.16 4.27 4.7  8. How many times was class cancelled  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 00 1/1646 5.00 4.67 4.69 4.71 5.6  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 4.13 4.13 4.06 4.24 4.1  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.8  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.8  2. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1386 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/221 **** 4.69 4.04 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instru	Ouestions	NR	NA		_			5		_		_			Mean
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 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. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Did on 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 931/1648 4.22 4.20 4.23 4.36 4.2   3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 617/1375 4.44 4.38 4.27 4.48 4.4   4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 722/1595 4.33 4.21 4.20 4.36 4.5   5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 1 2 4 3.67 1139/1533 3.67 3.88 4.04 4.14 3.6 4.5   6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 0 1 2 3 3.86 1055/1512 3.86 4.09 4.10 4.26 3.8   7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.08 4.16 4.27 4.7   8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.08 4.16 4.27 4.7   8. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 4.13 4.13 4.06 4.24 4.1   8. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.8   8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.8   8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.79 5.0   8. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.1   8. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.4   8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***   8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1388 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   8. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***   8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***   8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/221 **** 4.79 4.46 4.57 ***	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.33
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. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 4.13 4.13 4.06 4.24 4.15  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did 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 class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques sunderstanding of the material 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.28 4.16 4.73 ***  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.28 4.16 4.73 ***  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 241 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 242 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 242 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 242 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	931/1648	4.22	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 1 2 4 3.67 1139/1533 3.67 3.88 4.04 4.14 3.66 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 1055/1512 3.86 4.09 4.10 4.26 3.86 4.09 4.26 4.26 3.89 4.26 4.26 3.89 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 4.26 3.98 4.00 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 1055/1512 3.86 4.09 4.10 4.26 3.87   7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 8 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.08 4.16 4.27 4.75   9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.67 4.69 4.71 5.09   9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 4.13 4.13 4.06 4.24 4.15    Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.8   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.14   9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.45   9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.5    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1388 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***   4. Were special techniques sunderstanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/241 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/242 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.36	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.08 4.16 4.27 4.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.67 4.69 4.71 5.09 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 4.13 4.13 4.06 4.24 4.19    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.82   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.79 5.03   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.14   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.5   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.5    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.59 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.88	4.04	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.67 4.69 4.71 5.09 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 4.13 4.13 4.06 4.24 4.13    Lecture   1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.8   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.79 5.0   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.1   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.4   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.5    Discussion   1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***   4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***   4. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 242 **** 4.59 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ****   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ****	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1055/1512	3.86	4.09	4.10	4.26	3.86
Lecture	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.78
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. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. O 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***  9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1386 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***  9. Were special techniques successful  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  1. Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***  1. Were you provided with adequate background information  1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.55 4.43 4.54 4.62   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.79 5.03   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.5   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.5    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1388 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***   4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***    Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 220 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.79 5.03 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 *** 4.26 Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 *** Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.79 5.03 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.14 4.15 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1388 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 *** Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.12 4.61 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.55	4.43	4.54	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1073/1564 4.11 4.37 4.28 4.40 4.1 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.25 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.55 Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 *** 4.26 Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 *** 1.00 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 *** 4.77 4.35 4.63		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 777/1559 4.44 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.45 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.55 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.56 4.26 3.98 4.07 4.55 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 *** 4.25 4.30 4.58	•	0	0	0		1	3	4							4.11
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***  4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ****		0	0	0	0	0	5	4			4.44		4.29	4.41	4.44
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***  4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***		0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	275/1352	4.56			4.07	4.56
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.95 4.08 4.35 ***  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 ***  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 ***  4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.20 4.29 4.56 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***		7	Ω	1	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	3 00	****/1384	****	3 95	4 08	4 35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.25 4.30 4.58 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***							•	_		,	****				****
4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.88 3.95 4.31 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***										,	****				****
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	-					-		_		,					****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 4.78 4.16 4.73 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	I. Note Special committees successful	•	_	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ū	_	3.00	, , , , ,		3.00	3.75	1.51	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.54 4.12 4.61 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***		7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.78	4.16	4.73	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.69 4.40 4.57 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** 4.77 4.35 4.63 ***		7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.54			****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 2.77 4.35 4.63 ***		7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.69	4.40	4.57	****
•		7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.63	****
		7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.65			****
Seminar															
1. Well abbiglied topics relevant to the almounted theme of o o o o o is 1 3.00 / oo is 1.57 1.51 1.00		8		0		0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88		4.97	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 4.47 4.34				0		0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.68	4.47	4.54	****
5. Fig 1050grow projects concretated for realisting		-	-			-	-	_		, -					****
1. Did presentations contribute to what you rearned 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 / 32 1.20 1.33 1.11	-							1							****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.40 3.68 3.71 ***	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.40	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work	Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.95 4.06 4.86 ***	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.59 4.09 4.42 ***	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	***	4.59	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.52 ***	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.90 4.38 4.59 ***	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.90	4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.89 3.68 3.95 ***	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.89	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced	Self Paced														
		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.90	4.30	4.64	****
		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.81		4.24	****
		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.63			****
				0		0	0	1		****/ 24	****				****
		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: GES 481 0101

Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENV

Instructor: TANG, JUNME

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

TANG, JUNMEU Fal

University of Maryland Page 922
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: GES 601 0101 University of Maryland Page 923
Title INTRO TO GES Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 13
Ouestionnaires: 11

Fall 2008
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 7 4 4.36 830/1649 4.36 4.35 4.28 4.46 4.36 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 5 3 3.91 1229/1648 3.91 4.20 4.23 4.34 3.91 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 1067/1595 4.00 4.21 4.20 4.35 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 421/1533 4.45 3.88 4.04 4.28 4.45 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 627/1512 4.30 4.09 4.10 4.35 4.30 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 2 2 4 3 3.73 1287/1623 3.73 4.08 4.16 4.29 3.73 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 1240/1646 4.45 4.67 4.69 4.81 4.45 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 6 2 4.00 914/1621 4.05 4.13 4.06 4.20 4.05Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 372/1568 4.77 4.55 4.43 4.52 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1572 4.95 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.95 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 6 4 4.27 918/1564 4.23 4.37 4.28 4.41 4.234. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 763/1559 4.41 4.43 4.29 4.41 4.41 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 2 4 2 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.26 3.98 4.10 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 351/1384 4.64 3.95 4.08 4.30 4.64 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 243/1382 4.91 4.20 4.29 4.52 4.91 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1/1368 5.00 4.25 4.30 4.56 5.00 0 1 0 0 2 6 2 4.00 431/948 4.00 3.88 3.95 4.03 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful Seminar 8 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.97 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 2 4.67 38/ 85 4.67 4.68 4.47 4.50 4.67 0 0 1 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/ 81 5.00 4.97 4.43 4.43 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  $8 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 2 \ 4.33 \ 58/ \ 92 \ 4.33 \ 4.20 \ 4.35 \ 4.42 \ 4.33$ 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 1 1 1 0 0 2.00 266/288 2.00 3.40 3.68 3.87 2.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 4.90 4.30 4.37 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* 4.81 4.16 4.49 \*\*\*\* 10 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 4.63 4.43 4.43 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons Majors 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 00-27 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 4 Major 11 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 C 0 28-55 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 General 0 Under-grad 7 Non-maior D 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Grad. 4 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

10

I 0

? 2

Course-Section: GES 601 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO GES

Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

NEFF, ROBERT

		Question	ns		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		Genera	.1															
Did voi	n gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	Ο	7	4	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.3
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	5	3		1229/1648		4.20	4.23	4.34	3.9
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	5	3		1067/1595		4.21	4.20	4.35	4.0
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	421/1533		3.88	4.04	4.28	4.4
	_	-		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4		627/1512		4.09	4.10	4.35	4.
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	2	2	4	3		1287/1623		4.08	4.16	4.29	3.
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	6	5		1240/1646		4.67	4.69	4.81	4.4
	_			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	859/1621	4.05	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.0
		Lectur	re															
. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.77	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.7
. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.9
. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1564	4.23	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.3
. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	871/1559	4.41	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.4
. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.0
		Discus	ssion															
. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	351/1384	4.64	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.
Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	ncourage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.
. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.56	5.	
. Were sp	pecial te		0	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	4.0		
		Semina																
	_	_		announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 88		4.97	4.54	4.63	***
				ividual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 85		4.68	4.47	4.50	4.6
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 81		4.97	4.43	4.43	5.0
_		ons contribute		-	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	58/ 92		4.20	4.35	4.42	4.3
. Were ci	riteria f	for grading mad	de clear		8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	3 2.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	2.0
		Self			1.0		0	•	0	-	•	4 00	/	a dedealed	4 00	4 20	4 25	**1
	_	-		what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 53 ****/ 30		4.90	4.30	4.37	***
		tions make clea acts with the i			10 10	0 0	0	0	0 1	0	0	4.00	****/ 41		4.81 4.63	4.16 4.43	4.49 4.43	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
redits Ea			-								m.				M = = = = = =	_		
	arned 	Cum. GP <i>A</i>		Expected Grades					asons					pe 			Majors 	
00-27 28-55	3 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 4 B 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	4	Majo	or	13
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gor	nera	1				0	Under-	mad	7	Non	-major	(
34-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Gel	тета	_				U	onder -6	j±au	,	INOI1-	ilia JUL	,	
34-150 Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1 2	F 0		בות	ecti <sup>.</sup>	7760				0	#### _	Means t	here =	re not	enouc	rh
JI au.	ī	3.30- <del>1</del> .00	۷	P 0		11.1		v CB				U		ses to b			_	111
				I O		O+1	ner				1	.0	respons	co LU L	e sign	ııııdı	10	
				Ι 0		ULI	TCT					· U						

Page 924

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: GES 608 0101 FIELD ECOLOGY

Title

Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 925 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	•	0	0	0	0	•	2	F 00	1 /1 6 4 0	F 00	4 25	4 00	4 46	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648		4.20	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595		4.21	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1533		3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1512		4.09	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1623	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1037/1646		4.67	4.69	4.81	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	U	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572		4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.67
Discussion	_													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384		3.95	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382		4.20	4.29	4.52	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.78	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.61	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.80	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.66	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.97	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 85	5.00	4.68	4.47	4.50	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 81		4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 92		4.20	4.35	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 288	5.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.06	4.51	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 48	5.00	4.59	4.09	4.47	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 39	5.00	4.60	4.47		5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.90	4.38	4.44	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.89	3.68	3.83	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.90	4.30	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30		4.81		4.49	5.00
2. 214 2044, quebetono mane eteat ene expected goat	۷	J	3	3	3	J	_	5.00	1/ 30	3.00	1.01	1.10	1.10	5.00

Course-Section: GES 608 0101
Title FIELD ECOLOGY
Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS
Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 925 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: GES 616 0101 University of Maryland PHYSICAL HYDROLOGY Baltimore County MILLER, ANDREW

Title

Instructor:

Page 926 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

_																	
						Fre	equei	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 i			m this course	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam quest:				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluation				0	0	1	0	0	0	1		1537/1595	3.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	3.00
5. Did assigned reading				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assign	-		_		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading sys				0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was				0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.20	5.00
1. Were the instructor	Lecture		nrenared	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture materia		9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures co				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual ted				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352		4.26	3.98	4.10	5.00
	_	_	_														
	Discuss			_											4 00	4 00	
1. Did class discussion			_	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384		3.95	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students a				1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.52	4.00
<ol> <li>Did the instructor</li> <li>Were special technical</li> </ol>	_		a open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1368 431/ 948	4.00	4.25 3.88	4.30	4.56	4.00
4. were special techni	iques succes	ssiui		1	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	4.00
	Laborat	ory															
1. Did the lab increas	se understan	ding o	f the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.78	4.16	4.27	4.50
2. Were you provided	with adequat	e back	ground information	n 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 243	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.61	4.50
3. Were necessary mate				0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 212	4.50	4.69	4.40	4.73	4.50
4. Did the lab instru				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.80	5.00
5. Were requirements	for lab repo	rts cl	early specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.66	4.50
			Fred	nienci	/ Dis	trib	ıtioı	า									
		iuciic	DID	CIID	20101												
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	3			Rea	asons	5			Туј	эe			Majors	;
00-27 0	 0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	r )r	2
	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			-						3 -		
56-83 0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	0

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

Course-Section: GES 621 0101 University of Maryland Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 927

Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			1	0	1	0	1	1	4		1183/1649		4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
		ctor make clear		1 3	1	0	0	1	1	3	2		1271/1648		4.20	4.23	4.34	3.86
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	888/1375		4.38	4.27	4.44	4.14
		uations reflect			1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595		4.21	4.20	4.35	4.17
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	1		1103/1533		3.88	4.04	4.28	3.71
		_		o what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512		4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	1	1	1	4	0		1512/1623		4.08	4.16	4.29	3.14
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	w would you grade the overall teaching effectiv  Lecture					0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	654/1621	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.60
		Lectur																
	e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	956/1568		4.55	4.43	4.52	3.89
	e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1572		4.84	4.70	4.83	4.67
						0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	754/1564		4.37	4.28	4.41	3.89
					1	0	0	0	0	4	3		804/1559		4.43	4.29	4.41	4.14
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	582/1352	4.17	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.17
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1113/1384	3.43	3.95	4.08	4.30	3.43
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	4.20	4.29	4.52	3.57
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.14
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.88	3.95	4.03	2.60
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
				· <del>-</del>										- 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	e	4	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1 C 0		~		,				0	77 J		4	37		2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	0 0		Gei	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0 F 0								0		M · ·	1			.1-
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	- 0		EI	ecti	ves				0	#### -					JU
				P 0 I 0		0-1	h					4	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	IL.	
				T 0		Uti	her					4						

Course-Section: GES 621 0101 University of Maryland Page 928 Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Fall 2008

Job IRBR3029

(Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA		_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	L															
		ew insights,skil			1	0	1	0	1	1	4		1183/1649		4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	3	2		1271/1648		4.20	4.23	4.34	3.86
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	888/1375		4.38	4.27	4.44	4.14
		ations reflect		_	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17			4.21	4.20	4.35	4.17
	_	-		what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	1		1103/1533		3.88	4.04	4.28	3.71
				o what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2		, -		4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	1	1	1	4	0		1512/1623		4.08	4.16	4.29	3.14
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.60
		Lecture																
1 Were t	he instr			prepared	4	0	0	1	Ο	3	0	3 50	1460/1568	3.89	4.55	4.43	4.52	3.89
	the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	1	-		1400/1572		4.84	4.70	4.83	4.67
					4	0	1	0	0	2	1		1388/1564		4.37	4.28	4.41	3.89
		es contribute to			4	0	1	0	0	1	2		1277/1559		4.43	4.29	4.41	4.14
				our understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2			457/1352					4.17
		-	-	J														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1113/1384	3.43	3.95	4.08	4.30	3.43
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	4.20	4.29	4.52	3.57
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.14
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.88	3.95	4.03	2.60
				<b>D</b>		- <b>-</b> -			_									
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	Crib	JULIOI	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	 e	4	Majo	r or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					4						
				? 0														

Course-Section: GES 621 0101 University of Maryland Page 929
Title WATER/URBAN ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1271/1648	3.86	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1512/1623	3.14	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1401/1568	3.89	4.55	4.43	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1297/1564	3.89	4.37	4.28	4.41	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.14	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	690/1352	4.17	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3 43	1113/1384	3.43	3.95	4.08	4.30	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	2		1187/1382	3.57	4.20	4.29	4.52	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.56	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.88	3.95	4.03	2.60

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

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

Title Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW (Instr. A) Fall 2008 Page 930

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

-																		
							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera			_			_			_							
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	871/164		4.35	4.28	4.46	4.33
		ctor make clear		_	0	0	0	2	0	3	1		1481/164		4.20	4.23	4.34	3.50
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	636/159		4.21	4.20	4.35	4.40
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	703/153		3.88	4.04	4.28	4.17
		-		o what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	4	4.67	263/151		4.09	4.10	4.35	4.67
		g system clearl		ined	0	_	0	_	0	_	0		1571/162		4.08	4.16	4.29	2.80
	-	was class cand		hi	0 1	0	0	0	0	0 3	6 2	5.00	1/164		4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II tead	thing effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	3	2	4.40	511/162	L 3.95	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.95
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/156	3 4.20	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.20	
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1321/157	2 4.20	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.20		
		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	550/156	4.47	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.47		
		you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	832/155	4.37	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.37		
		your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	515/135		4.26	3.98	4.10	4.25		
		-	_	_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/138		3.95	4.08	4.30	4.83
				ed to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	887/138		4.20	4.29	4.52	4.17
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/136		4.25	4.30	4.56	4.33
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	844/ 94	3.00	3.88	3.95	4.03	3.00
		Semina	r															
2. Was the	e instru		_	lividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8	****	4.68	4.47	4.50	****
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8:		4.97	4.43	4.43	****
		ons contribute			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 9:		4.20	4.35	4.42	****
_																		
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			T	/pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0 00 0 00	0									0	Cwadua		 5	Mo de		1
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 1		кес	4urr.e	eu I	or Ma	JOES	>	0	Gradua	-E	5	Majo	)T	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-	arad	1	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001		-				J	Oliget :	, <u></u>	_	1,011		-
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.00	-	P 0								-		ses to l			_	•
				I 0		O±1	her					5	LOSPOIN		~-91			
						001						_						

Course-Section: GES 622 0101 University of Maryland Title RES DESIGN/URBAN ENV Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 931

Job IRBR3029

200000000000000000000000000000000000000				2 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -				~~~~										
								-	ncies				tructor		e Dept		Level	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	871/164	9 4.33	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.33
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1481/164	3.50	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.50
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	636/159	5 4.40	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.40
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	703/153	3 4.17	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.17
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/151	2 4.67	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.67
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1571/162	3 2.80	4.08	4.16	4.29	2.80
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/164	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1345/162	1 3.95	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.95
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1279/156	3 4.20	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1463/157	2 4.20	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.20	
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/156	4.47	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	901/155	9 4.37	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.37	
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	our understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/135	2 4.25	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.25	
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/138	4 4.83	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.83
				ed to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	,		4.20	4.29	4.52	4.17
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/136		4.25	4.30	4.56	4.33
		chniques succe		a open arbeabbion	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	844/ 94		3.88	3.95	4.03	3.00
		Semina																
2 Wag th	. inatmi		_	lividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 8	5 ****	4.68	4.47	4.50	****
					5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8		4.00	4.47	4.43	****
	_	rojects contrib ons contribute		what you learned	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 9		4.97	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	. you rearned	5	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 9	2	4.20	4.33	4.42	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ition	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			T	уре			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Gradua	 :e	 5	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1						J						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	_				0	Under-	grad	1	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										-			-	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				Р 0										ses to b			_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5	-					
				- 0														

Course-Section: GES 651 0101

Title URBAN SUSTAINABILITY

Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 932 FEB 11, 2009 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	0	1	0	0	3 00	1603/1649	3.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1124/1648	4.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	•	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	з 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572		4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564		4.37	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1121/1559		4.43	4.29	4.41	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.95	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948		3.88	3.95	4.03	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.97	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.68	4.47	4.50	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92		4.20	4.35	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.90	4.30	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.81	4.16	4.49	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.63	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24		4.88	4.42	4.67	5.00
Fre	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27						Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	-		
				2	0						

#### Course-Section: GES 681 0101 University of Maryland Page 933 Title REMOTE SENSING OF ENVI Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

	I	Fall	2008	
Student	Course	Evalua	tion	Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Fre	equei	ncies	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	0	1	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1531/1533	1.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained			1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1511/1512	1.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	1.00
			0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	3.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	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	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to be signi		nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	-	-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: GES 686 0101

Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 934 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			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	0	2	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1375	3.67	4.38	4.27	4.44	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.35	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.13	4.06	4.20	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.41	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.26	3.98	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1366/1384	2.00	3.95	4.08	4.30	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	0		1374/1382		4.20	4.29	4.52	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1364/1368	1.50	4.25	4.30	4.56	1.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.78	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 243		4.54	4.12	4.61	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.80	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/ 555	4.67	4.65	4.29	4.66	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.97	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.68	4.47	4.50	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.97	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	91/ 92	2.00	4.20	4.35	4.42	2.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.40	3.68	3.87	2.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.60	4.47	4.58	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

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