Spring 2006

Instructor: STERN, PHIL Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 19

Title

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101

BASKETBALL

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1099

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Questions							Fre	eque		S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	1	6	5	6	3.74	1265/1481	3.74	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.74
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	3	12				4.26	4.23	4.18	4.42
		uestions reflec			1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	***
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	***
		g system clearl			0	6	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	425/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	1	10	7	4.16	1288/1480	4.16	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.16
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	403/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.45
	Lecture																	
1 Were t	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	0	Ο	1	4	4 17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.17
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407		4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	0	0	1	4		910/1399		4.30	4.26	4.23	4.17
	Was lecture material presented and explained clears. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				13 13	1	0	0	1	0	4		492/1400		4.35	4.27	4.19	4.60
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				13	4	0	0	0	0	2		****/1179			3.96	3.85	****
ו הנת ו		Discus			15	0	2	0	0	0	2	2 00	****/1262	****	4 10	4.05	2 77	****
				what you learned d to participate	15	0	2	0	0	0			****/1259		4.18	4.05	3.77 4.06	****
				d to participate d open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/1259		4.40	4.29	4.08	****
		echniques succe		a open arscussion	15	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 788		4.03	4.00	3.80	****
4. Were s	peciai c	eciniiques succe	SSLUI		13	2	U	U	U	1		4.50	/ / / 60		4.03	4.00	3.00	
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99		A 3							 - 1	1	Cradust			Mada		
00-27 28-55	_		0			ке	quir	eu I	יואו ידר	ajor	s I	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	υL	0
28-55 56-83				C 0		Cor	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	L9	Non	major	7
84-150						Gel	пста.	т				_	onder-9	rau 1	L J	NOII-	iiia jul	,
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					ភ ា.	ecti	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
grau.	P 14					11.11	CCLI	vca				U	respons				_	111
				T 0		∩ +1	her					1	I CSPOIIS		oc bigi	ıııcaı		
				1 0		OLI	TICI					_						

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301 University of Maryland Title JOGGING Baltimore County Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

35

University of Maryland Page 1100
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescronnarie

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	7	4	5	2 12	1437/1481	3.13	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5 17	4.57	- , -	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.14	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1		1	0	0	0	3		****/1249	****	4.20	4.23	4.16	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	1	0	1		****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	0	3		****/1396		4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1		1	0	1	0	3		****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	, -		4.19	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21		351/1480		4.64	4.68	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	10	3		1151/1450		4.10	4.09		3.68
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	_	_	_	_	10	,	3.00	1131/1130	3.00	1.10	1.05	3.71	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407		4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1262	***	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	son	g			Ту	ne			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			_											
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 1		Gei	neral	_				3	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	major	4
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 4 D 0														
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 7 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
P 11									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
I 0		Otl	her					2						
? 0														

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101 University of Maryland Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING

Baltimore County Spring 2006

DAVIS, MURRAY Instructor:

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 28

Page 1101 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

- ·	 	
	Evaluation	

				Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1 Did you	cain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	1	3	12	10	4 07	1024/	1481	3.63	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.07
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	517/		4.01	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50
		estions reflec			2	19	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	718/		4.29	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.29
	_	ations reflect			2	20	0	1	2	0	3		****/		4.43	4.27	4.21	4.06	****
				what you learned	2	23	0	0	1	0	2		****/		****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
				o what you learned	2	23	0	0	1	1	1		****/		2.57	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
		system clearly		_	0	9	0	0	0	4	15		175/		4.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.79
		was class cance		.11104	1	0	0	0	1	16	10		1158/		4.14	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.33
	-			hing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	7			296/				4.09		4.55
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	18	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/	1409	3.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.70
		tor seem inter			16	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/		4.14	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.83
				explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/	1399	4.10	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.64
		s contribute to			17	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/	1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.40
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	14	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/	1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
		Discus	ai on																
1 Did ala				what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	2	3	1 17	****/	1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
				ed to participate	23	0	1	0	0	1	3		****/		****	4.10	4.05	4.06	****
		_	_	d open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	0	3 4		****/		****	4.34	4.29	4.08	****
		chniques succes		d open discussion	21	5	0	0	0	0	2		****/		****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
i. Were bp	cciai cc	ciniiques succe	SSIGI		21	3	U	O	Ü	O	2	3.00	,	700		1.05	1.00	3.00	
		Field																	
				hat you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
_	_	-		uation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	***
3. Was the	instruc	tor available	for con	sultation	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
		Self :																	
	_	-		what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
3. Were yo	ur conta	cts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S				Тур	pe			Majors	3
															- -				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 0	A 4 B 0		кес	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s I	/	Gra	duate	=	0	Majo)r.	0
28-55 56-83	3	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	2	В 0 С 0		Oc.	neral	1				1	TT~ ~1	020.00	rad 1	8	N⁺∽∽	mo dos	17
56-83 84-150	3 12	3.00-2.99	4	D 0		Gei	ieta.	L				т	OHO	er-gi	Lau 2	.0	MOII-	-major	Ι/
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	Б 0		בוק	ectiv	700				0	###	# _ 14	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
orau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					11.1		a o				U			es to b				1++
	I 0						ner					4	105	FOITD		c bigi	ıııcaı		
				? 0		001						-							

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201 AEROBIC CONDITIONING Baltimore County Instructor: SINGELTON, TARA

Title

University of Maryland Page 1102 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	43	
Questionnaires:	21	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ouestions							-	ncies	;			tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	.ls from	this course		0	0	3	4	6	2	6	3.19	1427/1481	3.63	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.19
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	4	7	5	5	3.52	1313/1481	4.01	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.52
		estions reflect				0	17	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1249	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.14	****
		ations reflect				0	14	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.43
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learn	.ed	0	16	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you lea:	rned	0	14	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1324/1342	2.57	4.12	4.07	3.88	2.57
7. Was th	ne gradino	system clearly	explai	ned		1	3	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	899/1459	4.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.12
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			1	0	2	0	2	9	7	3.95	1384/1480	4.14	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.95
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	.l teach	ing effective:	ness	5	1	1	3	5	5	1	3.13	1336/1450	3.84	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.13
		Lecture																	
		actor's lectures				12	0	3	0	4	1	1	2.67	1391/1409	3.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	2.67
2. Did th	d the instructor seem interested in the subject				12	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1376/1407	4.14	4.77	4.69	4.57	3.44	
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clearl		ly	14	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1223/1399	4.10	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.57		
4. Did th	s lecture material presented and explained clearl d the lectures contribute to what you learned			13	0	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1261/1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.38		
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understand	ing	13	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
		Discuss																	
		ussions contribu				16	0	1	0	2	1	1		****/1262		4.18	4.05	3.77	****
		nts actively end				16	0	0	0	2	0	3		****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
		ctor encourage f		open discuss		16	0	2	0	2	0	1		****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful			16	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
					Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	ades				Rea	sons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7			Rec	nni re	d fo	or Ma	jors	 1	 5	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			110	1411			. , 0 = 0	_	_	OI adda o	_	•	11000		ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1			Ger	neral					0	Under-g	rad 2	:1	Non-	-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									-	3				5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0			Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh
	P 9												respons				_		
				I O			Oth	ıer					1			3			
				? 0															
				. •															

Course-Section: PHED 112 0101

BEGINNING SWIMMING

ritie BEGINNING SWIMMING Instructor: HIMES, THOMAS

Instructor: HIMES, T
Enrollment: 19

Ouestionnaires: 15

Spring 2006

Page 1103

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 549/1481 4.50 4.26 4.29 4.14 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 736/1481 4.33 4.26 4.23 4.18 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 1046/1249 3.75 4.37 4.27 4.14 3.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/1424 **** 4.27 4.21 4.06 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 11 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/1396 **** 4.07 3.98 3.89 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1342 **** 4.12 4.07 3.88 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 7 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 $^{\circ}$ 1 1 0 6 4.38 647/1459 4.38 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.38 0 0 0 2 5 4 4 3.67 1446/1480 3.67 4.64 4.68 4.64 3.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 4 6 2 3.83 1030/1450 3.83 4.10 4.09 3.97 3.83 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1409 **** 4.46 4.42 4.36 **** 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1407 **** 4.77 4.69 4.57 **** 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1399 **** 4.30 4.26 4.23 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1400 **** 4.35 4.27 4.19 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1179 **** 3.94 3.96 3.85 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1262 **** 4.18 4.05 3.77 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.40 4.29 4.06 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.34 4.30 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 12 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 788 **** 4.03 4.00 3.80 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 3.95 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 4.37 4.20 4.20 **** Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 69 **** 4.26 4.53 4.18 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.14 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 **** 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 00 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 3.44 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 41 **** 3.68 4.26 **** **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.48 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.42 **** 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** 4.50 4.83 4.67 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned ______ 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 Graduate 0 Major Required for Majors 11 B 0 C 0 1.00-1.99 0 28-55 0 26-33 2 2.00-2.99 1 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 4 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 General 0 Under-grad 15 Non-major 5 D 0 Electives F 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 12 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1 ?

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101 University of Maryland PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County PETTIT, JULIE M

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 0 0

Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 17

Title

Page 1104 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

									T i		G	Damb	IIMDG	T 1	0
	Ouestions	NR	NT 7\	1	2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Mean	Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	Questions	11117									Mean			Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	3	7	3.88	1174/1481	3.82	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.88
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	560/1481	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.47
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	624/1249	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.40
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1123/1424	3.86	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.86
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	182/1459	4.61	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.78
8.	How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	997/1480	4.70	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.60
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	281/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.57
	T a reference														
1	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	1 60	648/1409	1 60	1 10	4 40	1 20	1 (0
		7	0	0	0 1	2	0	8	4.60	1031/1407		4.46	4.42	4.36 4.57	4.60 4.60
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.60	376/1399		4.77 4.30	4.69	4.23	4.60
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	U	7	4.67	791/1400		4.35	4.20	4.23	4.67
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	0	1	0	7		****/1179		3.94	3.96	3.85	****
э.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	О	/	U	U	1	U	3	4.50	***/11/9	***	3.94	3.90	3.85	
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	0	0	0	2	2.14	1242/1262	2.14	4.18	4.05	3.77	2.14
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1136/1259	3.33	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.33
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1134/1256	3.33	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.33
4.	Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
	Laboratory														
2		1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/ 240	****	4 00	1 11	2 05	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	16 15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249		4.08	4.11	3.95 4.33	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities		1	-	-	-	0	1		****/ 242					****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	-	1		****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	***	4.42	4.04	4.02	***
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	***	4.04	4.00	3.44	***
	Self Paced														
	Sell Faced														

Frequency Distribution

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.48 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.63 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	13			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201 University of Maryland PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County Spring 2006 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.

Title

Page 1105 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	35				
Questionnaires:	30	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions				NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	2	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
		w insights, skills fro		1	0	2	1	9	7	10		1254/14		3.82	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.76
		tor make clear the ex		1	0	0	1	7 0	8	13	4.14	934/14		4.30	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.14
	_	estions reflect the e ations reflect the ex	_	1	23 24	0 1	0	0	3 1	3		****/12 ****/14		4.40 3.86	4.37 4.27	4.27 4.21	4.14	****
		adings contribute to		2	26	0	0	0	1	1		****/13		****	4.27	3.98	3.89	****
	_	ignments contribute t	-	2	26	0	0	0	1	1		****/13		****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
		system clearly expla		2	10	0	1	2	3	12		550/14		4.61	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.44
		was class cancelled		3	1	0	0	0	5	21	4.81			4.70	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.81
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	3	5	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	786/14	150	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.09
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures well		25	0	0	0	2	1	2		****/14		4.60	4.46	4.42	4.36	****
		tor seem interested i	_	24	0	0	0	0	1	5		****/14		4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	***
		erial presented and e		24	0	0	1	2	0	3		****/13		4.67	4.30	4.26	4.23	****
		s contribute to what techniques enhance y	-	24 24	3	0	0	3 1	0	2		****/14 ****/11		4.33	4.35	4.27 3.96	4.19 3.85	****
5. DIG au	.uiovisuai	techniques enhance y	our understanding	24	3	U	U		U	۷	4.33	/11	L / 9		3.94	3.90	3.03	
1 Did al	acc diccu	Discussion ssions contribute to	what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	2 22	****/12	262	2.14	4.18	4.05	3.77	***
		ts actively encourage		27	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/12		3.33	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
		tor encourage fair an		27	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/12		3.33	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
		chniques successful		26	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 7	788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
		Field Work																
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribute to w	hat you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
_	_	understand your eval		29	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was th	e instruc	tor available for con	sultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
		Self Paced																
1. Did se	li-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı										
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 2	1	Gradu	ıate	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0															
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0		Gei	neral	L				1	Under	r-gr	rad 3	0	Non-	major	8
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 13	D 0								0			_	,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0 P 20		Ele	ectiv	res				2			Means t			_	n
			P 20 I 0		O+1	her					4	respo)IIS6	es to b	e sign	ıııcan	L	
			? 0		ULI	TICI					1							

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101 Title

SPORTS OFFICIATING

Instructor: PRIETO, JERRY

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1106 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	eaue:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	. Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.14
2. Did the instructor			0	0	0	1	2	1	3		1148/1481		4.26	4.23	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam ques			0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249		4.37	4.27	4.14	4.50
4. Did other evaluat		_	0	5	0	1	0	0	1		1275/1424		4.27	4.21	4.06	3.50
5. Did assigned read		_	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	707/1396		4.07	3.98	3.89	4.00
6. Did written assignment	_	_	0	5	0	1	0	0	1		1115/1342		4.12	4.07	3.88	3.50
7. Was the grading s	•	-	0	1	0	2	1	0	3		1201/1459		4.19	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times wa			0	0	0	1	1	3	2		1427/1480		4.64	4.68	4.64	3.86
9. How would you gra		ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	334/1450		4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	cor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00
Were all students			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00
4. Were special tech	nniques successful		2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provided	d with adequate bac	kground information	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	145/ 249	4.00	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.00
	Seminar		_			_										
2. Was the instructo	or available for in	dividual attention	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****
	Field Work					_		_	_							
1. Did field experie			4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 59		3.92	4.30	4.00	5.00
2. Did you clearly u	_		4	0	0	0	0	2		4.33	22/ 51		4.04	4.00	3.44	4.33
4. To what degree co			4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41		3.68	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences h	nelp you carry out	field activities	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	. ****	3.50	4.42	****	****
1 5 16 3	Self Paced		_		0	0		•	-	4 00	44/ ==	4 00	2 00	4 55	4 46	4 00
1. Did self-paced sy		_	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	44/ 55		3.90	4.55	4.48	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	41/ 51		4.42	4.65	4.63	4.50	
	4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 34		4.50	4.83	4.67	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	: ****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	
Freq					crib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Re	asons	3			Ту	тре			Majors	}

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
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	
				P	6			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHED 125 0101

VOLLEYBALL

35

BLANCHARD, IAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

Page 1107 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fr	-	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.75
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	192/1481	4.79	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.79
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.14	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	18	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
		g system clearl		ained	2	11	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.83
		was class cand			2	1	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.50
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	319/1450	4.53	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.53
	Lecture ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409	4.82	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.82
	the instructor's rectures well prepared that the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407		4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
					14	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	203/1399		4.30	4.26	4.23	4.82
		you learned	14 16	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1400		4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00		
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1262		4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00
				ed to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259		4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00
				nd open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256		4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	essful		18	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
		Field																
				what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 59		3.92	4.30	4.00	****
_	-	-		luation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 51		4.04	4.00	3.44	****
		ctor available			24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36		5.00	4.60	5.00	****
		could you disc			23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41		3.68	4.26	****	****
o. Dia co	nierences	s nelp you carr	y out 1	field activities	24	U	0	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
 00-27	0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s 1	9	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55										. ,		-	~~~	-	-		. •	•
56-83						Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	12
84-150													5				3	
Grad.							ecti [.]	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 17									respons				_	
	P 17						h 0 30					1						

Other

1

I

?

0

0

Spring 2006

Page 1108

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHED 136 0101

WOMEN'S LACROSSE

CONNOR, COURTNE

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	: I															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	600/1481	4.46	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.46
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	11		155/1481		4.26	4.23		4.85
		estions reflect		_	0	3	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	298/1249	4.70	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.70
4. Did ot	her evalı	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	248/1424	4.71	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.71
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to i	what you learned	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	***
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	3	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla:	ined	1	1	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	217/1459	4.73	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.73
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1326/1480	4.09	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.09
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	781/1450	4.10	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.10
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.86
2. Did the						0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.67		
4. Did the	e lecture	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.57		
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	7	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
		Laborat	cory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	e back	ground information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avail	lable f	or lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27									or Ma			6	Graduate		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55						1000	1411	-u 1	OT 1-10	בטנ.		J	Graduati	_	0	1.10.10	, <u>.</u>	J
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-gr	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001	u.	-				-	onder 9.			1,011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enona	rh
32 44.	P 8											-	response				_	,
				I O		Oth	ner					1					-	
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201 University of Maryland Page 1109
Title TENNIS Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 23

St.udent.	Course	Eva	luation	Oues	tionnair	2

Questionnaires: 17

								Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skil		m this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	531/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.53
	_	tor make clear				0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	349/1481	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.65
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected go	als	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.14	****
4. Did other	r evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goa	ls	0	11	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1424	4.65	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.50
5. Did assi	gned re	adings contribu	ite to	what you 1	earned	0	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	502/1396	4.25	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.25
6. Did writ	ten ass	signments contri	.bute t	o what you	learned	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the	Was the grading system clearly explained How many times was class cancelled					0	5	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	460/1459	4.57	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many	ow many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1274/1480	4.22	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.18
9. How would	ow would you grade the overall teaching effective						0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	751/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.13
		Lecture																	
1. Were the	instru	ctor's lectures	well	prepared		10	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1152/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00
		tor seem intere			ect	10	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
		erial presented		_		10	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	801/1399	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.29
		s contribute to		_	_	10	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	421/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.67
		techniques enh		-		11	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179			3.96	3.85	****
		Discuss	si on																
1. Did class	s discu	ssions contribu		what vou l	earned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
		nts actively end		-		15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1259		4.40	4.29	4.06	****
		tor encourage f	_	_	_	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1256		4.34	4.30	4.08	****
			Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n											
Credits Ear	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4						Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 lajor	s 1	1	Graduat	e e	0	Majo	or	0

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	12			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301

TENNIS

19

PURYEAR, RAYMON

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Page 1110 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	aain n	General ew insights,skil	=	thia acurac	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	587/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.47
		ew insights,skii ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.47	169/1481	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.14	4.47
		uestions reflect			1	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.62	334/1249	4.74	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.62
		uestions reflect uations reflect			Τ.	12	0	0	0	1	4				4.27	4.21	4.14	4.80
		uations reffect eadings contribu	_		1	14	0	0	0	0	2		****/1396		4.27	3.98	3.89	****
	_	_		what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
		g system clearly		2	0	6	0	0	2	0	۵	4.64	, -		4.12	4.16	4.17	4.64
		was class cance		inea	1	1	0	0	0	11	4		1208/1480		4.64	4.68	4.64	4.27
				ing effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	8	_	4.00	,		4.10	4.09		4.00
J. 110W WO	outa you	grade the overal	.i ceaci	ing effectiveness		U	_		U	O	J	1.00	030/1430	1.07	4.10	4.00	3.91	1.00
		Lecture	<u>,</u>															
1 Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1399	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1400		4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir					2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1179		3.94		3.85	
													_,					
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	ouraged	l to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air and	l open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	sful	_	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra-							Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	1
84-150																		
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
											respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it			
				I 0		Otl	her					5						
				3 0	Other !													

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101
Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)

Instructor: CARINGI, PETE

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1111 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	0	17	4.62	450/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.62
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	264/1481	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.71
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	196/1249	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.82
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	395/1424	4.77	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.55
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	156/1396	4.86	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.71
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	7	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	715/1480	4.89	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.89
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	311/1450	4.53	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.53
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.73
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.75
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	523/1399	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.55
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1400	4.64	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.64
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.43
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
	Laboratory														
2	-	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
	 Were you provided with adequate background information Were necessary materials available for lab activities 			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	***
	Frequ	enc:	. Die	trib	ıtior	1									
	rredr	iency	ומוע	CIIDI	10101	1									
Cr	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	12			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 144 0201
Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)
Instructor: ADAMS, ANTHONY
Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1112 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionna	ire
--------------------------------------	-----

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.27	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	4.86	4.07	3.98	3.89	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1480	4.89	4.64	4.68	4.64	***
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1450	4.53	4.10	4.09	3.97	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	***	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101 University of Maryland Title WATERPOLO Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1113

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_		_	_		_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1396	***	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0 1	0	0	0 2	7	4 6		1139/1480		4.64	4.68	4.64	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	Τ	U	U	2	2	О	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2 00	1146/1060	2 00	1 10	4 05	2 77	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8 8	0	1 0	0	1 0	0	1	5.00	1146/1262 1/1259	3.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00 5.00	4.40 4.34	4.29 4.30	4.06 4.08	5.00 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1250		4.03	4.00	3.80	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/ /66	5.00	4.03	4.00	3.00	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar							_							****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	***	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/	****	2 00	4 55	1 10	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10 10	0	0	0	0	-	1		****/ 34 ****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	ΤU	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	/ 24		4.50	4.82	4.58	

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101

Title WATERPOLO

Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1113 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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