

Course-Section: GES 102 0101  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: LUNA, RONALD  
 Enrollment: 125  
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 873  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	16	19	51	4.38	818/1576	4.34	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	14	19	51	4.36	811/1576	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	6	18	57	4.49	595/1342	4.51	4.19	4.32	4.19	4.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	45	3	2	9	8	20	3.95	1103/1520	3.82	4.33	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	38	12	2	9	12	14	3.29	1331/1465	3.49	4.06	4.12	4.02	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	62	2	2	5	5	11	3.84	1039/1434	3.84	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	8	15	59	4.51	527/1547	4.56	4.41	4.19	4.10	4.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	16	43	26	4.12	1417/1574	4.49	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	0	9	33	33	4.19	772/1554	4.19	4.27	4.10	4.01	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	2	11	66	4.73	568/1488	4.76	4.71	4.47	4.41	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	4	6	71	4.83	759/1493	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	3	23	53	4.56	619/1486	4.60	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	2	3	15	60	4.62	565/1489	4.70	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	11	2	1	8	11	46	4.44	366/1277	4.45	4.31	4.03	3.91	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	4	3	7	12	11	3.62	1014/1279	3.55	3.98	4.17	3.96	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	2	2	9	6	19	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.40	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	2	2	7	6	21	4.11	907/1269	4.19	4.43	4.35	4.09	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	27	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	****/ 878	2.88	3.89	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.54	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.53	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.33	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.52	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.57	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	85	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	4.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	4.38	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	85	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: GES 102 0101  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: LUNA, RONALD  
 Enrollment: 125  
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 873  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	9	Under-grad	88	Non-major	87
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 102 0201  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 147  
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 874  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	10	19	31	4.30	904/1576	4.34	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	14	39	4.51	608/1576	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	14	41	4.52	562/1342	4.51	4.19	4.32	4.19	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	42	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1290/1520	3.82	4.33	4.25	4.09	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	4	6	6	17	15	3.69	1152/1465	3.49	4.06	4.12	4.02	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	47	1	3	3	3	4	3.43	****/1434	3.84	4.27	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	11	45	4.61	411/1547	4.56	4.41	4.19	4.10	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	2	1	0	57	4.87	547/1574	4.49	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	0	4	29	13	4.20	772/1554	4.19	4.27	4.10	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	4	53	4.78	442/1488	4.76	4.71	4.47	4.41	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	2	55	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	0	11	46	4.65	484/1486	4.60	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	8	48	4.78	350/1489	4.70	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	2	5	10	38	4.46	347/1277	4.45	4.31	4.03	3.91	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	4	10	6	5	3.48	1072/1279	3.55	3.98	4.17	3.96	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	2	6	3	13	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.40	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	7	4	14	4.28	803/1269	4.19	4.43	4.35	4.09	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	37	9	2	5	5	1	3	2.88	829/ 878	2.88	3.89	4.05	3.91	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.54	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 379	****	4.53	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.33	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.52	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.57	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.38	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: GES 102 0201  
 Title HUMAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 147  
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 874  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	22	22	4.38	818/1576	4.47	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	14	28	4.46	683/1576	4.51	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	10	32	4.52	562/1342	4.53	4.19	4.32	4.19	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	43	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1520	4.41	4.33	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	22	1	2	8	4	9	3.75	1102/1465	3.97	4.06	4.12	4.02	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	45	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1434	****	4.27	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	1	10	34	4.67	327/1547	4.61	4.41	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	6	41	4.79	683/1574	4.55	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	4	21	13	4.24	732/1554	4.23	4.27	4.10	4.01	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	4	41	4.85	339/1488	4.89	4.71	4.47	4.41	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	1	43	4.91	501/1493	4.93	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	8	36	4.72	393/1486	4.77	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	39	4.72	434/1489	4.79	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	4	4	32	4.55	288/1277	4.62	4.31	4.03	3.91	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	****/1279	3.13	3.98	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	****/1270	3.63	4.40	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	****/1269	3.73	4.43	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	38	7	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	4.54	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.53	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.33	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.52	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.57	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.38	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: GES 110 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 107  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 875  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 7	General 3	Under-grad 50 Non-major 50
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other 12	

Course-Section: GES 110 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF  
 Enrollment: 126  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 876  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	13	27	4.56	568/1576	4.47	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	28	4.56	542/1576	4.51	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	28	4.53	552/1342	4.53	4.19	4.32	4.19	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	683/1520	4.41	4.33	4.25	4.09	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	9	12	20	4.19	708/1465	3.97	4.06	4.12	4.02	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	36	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/1434	****	4.27	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	7	30	4.55	480/1547	4.61	4.41	4.19	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	27	14	4.31	1288/1574	4.55	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	17	13	4.23	742/1554	4.23	4.27	4.10	4.01	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	198/1488	4.89	4.71	4.47	4.41	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	279/1493	4.93	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	251/1486	4.77	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	35	4.85	251/1489	4.79	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	11	25	4.69	194/1277	4.62	4.31	4.03	3.91	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1167/1279	3.13	3.98	4.17	3.96	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	1	4	7	3	3.63	1107/1270	3.63	4.40	4.35	4.09	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	1043/1269	3.73	4.43	4.35	4.09	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	14	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GES 120 0101  
 Title ENV SCIENCE/CONSERVATI  
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE  
 Enrollment: 138  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 877  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	6	15	32	4.20	1012/1576	4.20	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	7	3	21	27	4.12	1067/1576	4.12	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	4	19	26	3.95	1029/1342	3.95	4.19	4.32	4.19	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	3	3	7	9	16	3.84	1205/1520	3.84	4.33	4.25	4.09	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	10	19	21	3.93	961/1465	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.02	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	6	2	5	10	15	3.68	1132/1434	3.68	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	5	13	33	4.29	805/1547	4.29	4.41	4.19	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	4	52	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	3	1	10	18	19	3.96	978/1554	3.96	4.27	4.10	4.01	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	6	45	4.69	624/1488	4.69	4.71	4.47	4.41	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	1	54	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	4	12	36	4.44	778/1486	4.44	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	2	1	10	38	4.38	834/1489	4.38	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	1	5	6	38	4.48	328/1277	4.48	4.31	4.03	3.91	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	2	8	2	8	3.80	938/1279	3.80	3.98	4.17	3.96	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.40	4.35	4.09	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.43	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	10	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GES 220 0101  
 Title ENV SCI LAB & FIELD TE  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 878  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	697/1576	4.47	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	****	4.19	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	902/1520	4.21	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.06	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.41	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	4.58	4.27	4.10	4.05	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.71	4.47	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.51	4.32	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	660/1489	4.53	4.54	4.32	4.31	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	638/1277	4.13	4.31	4.03	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.43	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 232	****	4.54	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	****	4.53	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 52	4.75	4.52	4.48	4.74	4.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	27/ 48	4.50	4.67	4.40	4.71	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	35/ 44	4.50	4.50	4.73	4.69	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	36/ 45	4.25	4.38	4.57	4.64	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	Under-grad 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 14
				P 0	Electives 0

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

I	0	Other	12
?	0		

Course-Section: GES 286 0101  
 Title EXPL ENV: GEO-SPAT VIE  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 879  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	373/1576	4.69	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	568/1576	4.54	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	467/1342	4.62	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	385/1520	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	461/1434	4.45	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	985/1547	4.08	4.41	4.19	4.22	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1219/1574	4.38	4.76	4.64	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	692/1554	4.27	4.27	4.10	4.05	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	484/1488	4.77	4.71	4.47	4.44	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	708/1493	4.85	4.88	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	545/1486	4.62	4.51	4.32	4.29	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	660/1489	4.54	4.54	4.32	4.31	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	250/1277	4.62	4.31	4.03	4.01	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	732/1279	4.17	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	3.89	4.05	3.92	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	42/ 234	4.71	4.74	4.23	4.44	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	141/ 240	4.29	4.68	4.35	4.47	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	182/ 229	4.29	4.64	4.51	4.65	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	165/ 232	4.00	4.54	4.29	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	193/ 379	4.14	4.53	4.20	4.29	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.33	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.52	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.57	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	39/ 52	4.17	4.52	4.48	4.74	4.17	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	34/ 48	4.17	4.67	4.40	4.71	4.17	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.50	4.73	4.69	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	42/ 45	3.83	4.38	4.57	4.64	3.83	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	155/ 326	4.20	4.40	4.03	4.43	4.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: GES 286 0101  
 Title: EXPL ENV: GEO-SPAT VIE  
 Instructor: SCHOOL, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 879  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 302A 0101  
 Title WATERSHED SCIENCE & MG  
 Instructor: BAKER, MATTHEW  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 880  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	829/1576	4.37	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	7	6	3.89	1242/1576	3.89	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	905/1342	4.16	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	1017/1520	4.05	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	1421/1465	2.86	4.06	4.12	4.09	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	857/1434	4.05	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	4	6	3.74	1247/1547	3.74	4.41	4.19	4.21	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	9	5	2	3.56	1281/1554	3.56	4.27	4.10	4.09	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	1282/1488	3.95	4.71	4.47	4.47	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	1029/1493	4.68	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	7	3	6	3.53	1325/1486	3.53	4.51	4.32	4.32	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	9	4.05	1091/1489	4.05	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1119/1277	3.20	4.31	4.03	4.11	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	1	2	1	2.44	1256/1279	2.44	3.98	4.17	4.20	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1147/1270	3.44	4.40	4.35	4.42	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1131/1269	3.44	4.43	4.35	4.41	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	855/ 878	2.38	3.89	4.05	4.09	2.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.38	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.78	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		

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

I	0	Other	14
?	1		

Course-Section: GES 305 0101  
 Title LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: ELLIS, ERLE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 881  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	2	4	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.52	4.30	4.30	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	2	3	1	2.58	1564/1576	2.58	4.34	4.27	4.28	2.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	1	3	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.19	4.32	4.30	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	1	3	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	5	1	3.08	1372/1465	3.08	4.06	4.12	4.09	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	1	4	3.17	1339/1434	3.17	4.27	4.14	4.15	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	2	5	3.33	1396/1547	3.33	4.41	4.19	4.21	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1514/1554	2.67	4.27	4.10	4.09	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1383/1488	3.55	4.71	4.47	4.47	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	1248/1493	4.45	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	1	1	3	2.91	1444/1486	2.91	4.51	4.32	4.32	2.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	0	2	1	3	2.73	1457/1489	2.73	4.54	4.32	4.34	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	2	0	4	3.20	1119/1277	3.20	4.31	4.03	4.11	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1264/1279	2.33	3.98	4.17	4.20	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1091/1270	3.67	4.40	4.35	4.42	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	4.43	4.35	4.41	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	858/ 878	2.33	3.89	4.05	4.09	2.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GES 307 0101  
 Title CONSERVATION BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 882  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	215/1342	4.84	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	4	15	4.39	695/1520	4.39	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	5	5	9	3.71	1138/1465	3.71	4.06	4.12	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	9	10	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	228/1547	4.76	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	289/1554	4.63	4.27	4.10	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	708/1493	4.84	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	393/1486	4.72	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	268/1277	4.58	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	603/1279	4.33	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	836/1270	4.23	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269	4.85	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: GES 310 0101  
 Title GEOMORPHOLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 883  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	742/1576	4.43	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	528/1576	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	480/1342	4.61	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	597/1520	4.45	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	3	13	4.13	768/1465	4.13	4.06	4.12	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	659/1434	4.27	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	17	4.57	457/1547	4.57	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	876/1554	4.09	4.27	4.10	4.09	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	547/1488	4.74	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	501/1493	4.91	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	777/1489	4.43	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	148/1277	4.77	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	870/1269	4.17	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: GES 326 0101  
 Title CONSERVATION THOUGHT  
 Instructor: PARKER, EUGENE  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 884  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	227/1576	4.82	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	24	4.62	462/1576	4.62	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	24	4.59	500/1342	4.59	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	6	23	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	25	4.68	257/1465	4.68	4.06	4.12	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	503/1547	4.53	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	29	5	4.15	1398/1574	4.15	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	339/1488	4.85	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	11	20	4.52	666/1486	4.52	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	6	7	17	4.29	497/1277	4.29	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	413/1279	4.56	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	447/1270	4.72	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	421/1269	4.78	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	10	Under-grad	35	Non-major	29
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GES 341 0101  
 Title URBAN GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: NEFF, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 885  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	324/1576	4.73	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	321/1342	4.73	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	513/1465	4.40	4.06	4.12	4.09	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	564/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	518/1554	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.09	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	642/1486	4.53	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	406/1489	4.73	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	293/1277	4.53	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	510/1279	4.44	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	694/1269	4.44	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.50	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.38	4.57	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	7	Under-grad
			Electives	2	15
			Other	4	Non-major
					10
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GES 383 0101  
 Title STAT/THEMATIC CARTOGRP  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 886  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	130/1576	4.92	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	267/1576	4.77	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	418/1520	4.58	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1282/1465	3.43	4.06	4.12	4.09	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	160/1547	4.85	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.27	4.10	4.09	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.71	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1486	4.92	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	94/1277	4.92	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	712/1279	4.20	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.74	4.23	4.24	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.68	4.35	4.32	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	57/ 232	4.75	4.54	4.29	4.16	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 379	4.75	4.53	4.20	4.17	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: GES 386 0101  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 887  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1322/1576	3.73	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.19	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1225/1520	3.82	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1123/1465	3.73	4.06	4.12	4.09	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	1111/1434	3.73	4.27	4.14	4.15	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	1288/1554	3.55	4.27	4.10	4.09	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1025/1488	4.36	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1176/1493	4.55	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1384/1486	3.27	4.51	4.32	4.32	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1290/1489	3.64	4.54	4.32	4.34	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	489/1277	4.30	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1034/1279	3.57	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	881/1270	4.14	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	882/1269	4.14	4.43	4.35	4.41	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 234	4.75	4.74	4.23	4.24	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	69/ 240	4.67	4.68	4.35	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	93/ 229	4.67	4.64	4.51	4.48	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	75/ 232	4.67	4.54	4.29	4.16	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	128/ 379	4.33	4.53	4.20	4.17	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 400A 0101  
 Title ARCTIC GEOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: HUEMMRICH, KEN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 888  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	321/1342	4.73	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1228/1465	3.55	4.06	4.12	4.22	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	795/1574	4.73	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	816/1554	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.24	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	273/1277	4.57	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1279	****	3.98	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.43	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.33	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.52	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.57	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	4

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

Course-Section: GES 406 0101  
 Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 889  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	373/1576	4.70	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	902/1520	4.21	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	8	2	5	3.35	1310/1465	3.35	4.06	4.12	4.22	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	8	3	7	3.94	953/1434	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.30	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1324/1574	4.25	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	584/1554	4.37	4.27	4.10	4.24	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	926/1279	3.83	3.98	4.17	4.31	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	59/ 234	4.62	4.74	4.23	4.28	4.62	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	103/ 240	4.46	4.68	4.35	4.45	4.46	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	27/ 229	4.92	4.64	4.51	4.70	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	45/ 232	4.83	4.54	4.29	4.56	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	62/ 379	4.62	4.53	4.20	4.19	4.62	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	36/ 52	4.67	4.52	4.48	4.70	4.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	26/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	4.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.50	4.73	4.60	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/ 45	4.83	4.38	4.57	4.34	4.83	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 20
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 18

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

Course-Section: GES 413 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN BIOGEOGRAPH  
 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 890  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	515/1576	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.19	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.27	4.10	4.24	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.43	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.33	4.72	4.77	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.52	4.69	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.57	4.64	4.64	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.57	4.61	4.52	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.10	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.50	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: GES 415 0101  
 Title CLIMATE CHANGE  
 Instructor: HALVERSON, JEFF  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 891  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	387/1576	4.68	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	877/1576	4.32	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	11	9	4.27	819/1342	4.27	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	792/1520	4.32	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	941/1434	3.95	4.27	4.14	4.30	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	624/1547	4.45	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.24	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	401/1488	4.81	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	271/1486	4.81	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	421/1277	4.38	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	3	3	1	1	2.60	1240/1279	2.60	3.98	4.17	4.31	2.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1006/1270	3.90	4.40	4.35	4.53	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	0	4	4	3.80	1018/1269	3.80	4.43	4.35	4.55	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 429 0101  
 Title SEM GEOG DISEASE/HEALT  
 Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 892  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	146/1576	4.92	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.19	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1465	4.92	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.27	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	568/1488	4.73	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	261/1486	4.82	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	4.63	3.89	4.05	4.33	4.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.54	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.53	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.33	4.72	4.77	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	56/ 79	4.57	4.52	4.69	4.69	4.57	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 72	4.71	4.57	4.64	4.64	4.71	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	37/ 80	4.71	4.57	4.61	4.52	4.71	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	174/ 375	4.29	4.10	4.01	3.90	4.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.50	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.38	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.40	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.50	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: GES 429 0101  
 Title SEM GEOG DISEASE/HEALT  
 Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 892  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 442 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN METROPOL BA  
 Instructor: BENNETT, SARI J  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 893  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	742/1576	4.44	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	1311/1576	3.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1123/1342	3.78	4.19	4.32	4.46	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	441/1520	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	529/1465	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	353/1434	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	881/1574	4.69	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.27	4.10	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	948/1489	4.27	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	664/1277	4.07	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	4.43	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.89	4.05	4.33	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.33	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.52	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.57	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.57	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 375	****	4.10	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.52	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: GES 480 0101  
 Title ADV CARTOGRAPHIC APPL  
 Instructor: RABENHORST, THO  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 894  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.24	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.71	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	934/1489	4.29	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1277	4.83	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 486 0101  
 Title ADV APPL GEOG INFO SYS  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 895  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1209/1342	3.50	4.19	4.32	4.46	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	4.27	4.10	4.24	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.71	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1207/1486	3.88	4.51	4.32	4.41	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.31	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	****	3.98	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	4.43	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.74	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.68	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.64	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.54	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.53	4.20	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 602 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODS/GES  
 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 896  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	697/1576	4.46	4.52	4.30	4.43	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	785/1576	4.38	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	596/1465	4.31	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	544/1434	4.38	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1251/1547	3.73	4.41	4.19	4.24	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	518/1554	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.18	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	624/1488	4.69	4.71	4.47	4.52	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	708/1493	4.85	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	325/1486	4.77	4.51	4.32	4.37	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	565/1489	4.62	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.31	4.03	4.08	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	425/1279	4.54	3.98	4.17	4.34	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	478/1270	4.69	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	432/1269	4.77	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	547/ 878	3.92	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.92	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 602 0101  
 Title Research Methods  
 Instructor: Baker, Matthew  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 3  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	808/1576	****	4.51	4.30	4.11	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1032/1576	****	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	385/1520	****	4.35	4.25	4.09	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	668/1465	****	4.27	4.12	4.02	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	448/1434	****	4.42	4.14	3.94	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1303/1547	****	4.22	4.19	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	805/1554	****	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	920/1488	****	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	****	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	325/1486	****	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	888/1489	****	4.49	4.32	4.22	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	560/1277	****	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	425/1279	****	4.66	4.17	3.96	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	478/1270	****	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	511/1269	****	4.81	4.35	4.09	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	464/ 878	****	4.28	4.05	3.91	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 606 0101  
 Title AQUATIC ECOLOGY  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 897  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.19	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.71	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.31	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.43	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.74	4.23	4.36	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.68	4.35	4.37	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.64	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.47	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.52	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.67	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.50	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.38	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.40	4.03	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 613 0101  
 Title BIOGEOGRAPHY SEMINAR  
 Instructor: LEWIS, LAURAJEA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 898  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.71	4.47	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.31	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.43	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 623 0101  
 Title MODELING URBAN ENVIR  
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 899  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.19	4.32	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.18	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.69	4.71	4.47	4.52	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	4.56	4.51	4.32	4.37	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.44	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	889/1277	3.58	4.31	4.03	4.08	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.98	4.17	4.34	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 623 0101  
 Title MODELING URBAN ENVIR  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 900  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.19	4.32	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.18	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.69	4.71	4.47	4.52	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1330/1486	4.56	4.51	4.32	4.37	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1415/1489	4.44	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.58	4.31	4.03	4.08	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.98	4.17	4.34	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 623 0101  
 Title MODELING URBAN ENVIR  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 901  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.19	4.32	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	924/1554	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.18	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.69	4.71	4.47	4.52	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	4.56	4.51	4.32	4.37	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	4.44	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	889/1277	3.58	4.31	4.03	4.08	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.98	4.17	4.34	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 623 0101  
 Title MODELING URBAN ENVIR  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 902  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.19	4.32	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	712/1554	3.94	4.27	4.10	4.18	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.69	4.71	4.47	4.52	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.56	4.51	4.32	4.37	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.44	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1086/1277	3.58	4.31	4.03	4.08	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.98	4.17	4.34	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: GES 629 0101  
 Title SEM: GEOG DIS. & HLTH  
 Instructor: BIEHLER, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 903  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.06	4.12	4.25	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.71	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.31	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.43	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GES 686 0101  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 904  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.52	4.30	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.27	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.71	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.51	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.31	4.03	4.08	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1270/1279	2.00	3.98	4.17	4.34	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.43	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.89	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	117/ 234	4.33	4.74	4.23	4.36	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	69/ 240	4.67	4.68	4.35	4.37	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	172/ 229	4.33	4.64	4.51	4.51	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	165/ 232	4.00	4.54	4.29	4.47	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	128/ 379	4.33	4.53	4.20	4.37	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	85/ 85	3.00	4.33	4.72	4.79	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.52	4.69	4.77	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.57	4.64	4.70	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	70/ 80	4.00	4.57	4.61	4.70	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	4.10	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.52	4.48	4.40	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.67	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.50	4.73	4.88	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 45	4.00	4.38	4.57	4.65	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	157/ 326	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.10	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 40	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.50	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 24	4.00	4.00	4.83	4.80	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.33	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 28	4.00	4.00	4.78	4.75	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	185/ 382	4.00	4.50	4.08	4.13	4.00	

Course-Section: GES 686 0101  
 Title INTRO GEOG INFO SYSTEM  
 Instructor: TANG, JUNMEU  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 904  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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