Course-Section: PHED 105 1
Title Basketball
Instructor: Stern,Phil

37

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1070 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

1

							FIE	eque	псте	S		Inst	Lructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	2	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1354/1447	3.44	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.44
		tor make clear			2	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31			4.41	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.88
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.20
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	12	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.36	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	2	5	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	310/1427	4.64	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.64
8. How man	ny times v	was class canc	elled		1	2	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	1316/1447	4.13	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.13
9. How wor	uld you g	ching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.00		
		T +	_															
1 Wara +1	ho ingtru	Lectur ctor's lecture		propored	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.58
		n the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	10		,		4.52	4.73	4.71			
				explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50			4.47	4.32	4.32	
		s contribute t		1	7	0	0	0	2	2	7		,		4.43	4.32	4.31	
				our understanding	5	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	,		4.14			4.00
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	ccciniiqueb en	ilailee j	our underbeanding	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	3	_	3	1.00	032/11/3	1.00		1.02	3.33	1.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.33
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	965/1170	3.83	4.23	4.38	4.17	3.83
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		12	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	ason	a			Ty	20			Majors	,
crearts Ea	u	Expected Grades					asom	5 			ту.	ре 			Majors	, 		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	L				8	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	յh
				P 5									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
						0.1												

Other

I 0

? 0

Course-Section: PHED 109 02 University of Maryland Title Jogging Instructor: Tracy,Patrick W

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1071

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
g1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	7	2	4	2	3	2 56	1439/1447	2.56	3.88	4.31	4.18	2.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	3	2	7		1361/1447	3.33	4.41	4.27	4.10	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	1	0	0	2		****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	1	0	0	2		****/1402		4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	1	0	0		****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	0	0	0		****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	9	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	680/1427		4.61	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	9	5		1343/1447		4.25	4.69	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	0	5	4	2		1300/1434				4.10	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1341/1387	3.14	4.40	4.46	4.46	3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1385/1387	2.71	4.52	4.73	4.71	2.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	0	3	0	2		1328/1386	3.00	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	2	1	1	0	2		1334/1380	2.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	***	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 168	***	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	***	5.00	4.43	3.73	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 109 02 Title Jogging

Instructor: Tracy, Patrick W

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1071 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	6			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 111 02 University of Maryla Title Aerobic Conditioning Baltimore County Instructor: Gallagher, Andre Spring 2010

University of Maryland Page 1072
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	32			
Questionnaires:	17	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0		6	2	3	1	5		1431/1447		3.88	4.31	4.18	2.82
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	1	5	3	6		1293/1447	3.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	3.59
		estions reflect			2	11	0	1	0	1	2		****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
		ations reflect	_	_	0	14	0	1	0	0	2		****/1402		4.58	4.24	4.15	****
	_	-		hat you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	2		****/1358		4.59	4.11	4.03	****
		_		what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	2		****/1316		4.36	4.14	3.99	****
		g system clearly	-	ned	1	5	0	0	1	1	9		228/1427			4.19	4.24	4.73
	. How many times was class cancelled . How would you grade the overall teaching effective					0	0	0	0	12	5		1228/1447		4.25	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How wor	How would you grade the overall teaching effective					3	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1300/1434	3.31	4.11	4.10	4.10	3.31
	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	0	2	0	2		1317/1387				4.46	3.40
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						1	0	1	1	2		1359/1387	3.60	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.60
		-		plained clearly	12	0	1	0	2	0			1283/1386	3.40	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.40
		es contribute to			12	0	1	0	2	0			1270/1380	3.40	4.43	4.32		3.40
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	12	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
		Discus																
				hat you learned	16	-	0	0	1	0	0		****/1172			4.15	3.95	****
		_	_	to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1182			4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Rec	auire	ed f	 or M	ajors		0	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1101	1022	-	·	, 01 2		Ü	OZ dadao	_	Ü		-	Ü
56-83						Ger	nera:	1			1	.3	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0							_	-					5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
	-	2.22 2.00	-	P 7								_	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.h	ner					0		~			-	
				? 0		2 02						-						
				• •														

Course-Section: PHED 121 01

Physical Fitness

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 17

Fahey, Kelly A

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1073 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	mier	cies			Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	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	1	4	2	7	3.53	1333/1447	3.74	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	575/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1402	4.50	4.58	4.24	4.15	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.84	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1101/1447	4.54	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	600/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	0	0	7		1030/1387	4.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	431/1386	4.63	4.47		4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	463/1380	4.78	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1193	3.67	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1172	3.60	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	4.25	4.34	4.15	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 800	****	4.23	4.36	3.95	****
4. were special techniques successful	12	2	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	***/ 800		4.00	4.06	3.95	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	10	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 2/		3.00	4.43	3.73	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 121 01

Title Physical Fitness Instructor: Fahey, Kelly A

Instructor: Fahe Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1073 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	9			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 03 University of Maryland Physical Fitness

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title Instructor: Mumma, Robert S

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 22

Page 1074 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

		Question		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain new	v insights,ski		n this course	0	0	1	0	6	7	8	3.95	1108/1447	3.74	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.95
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	327/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.68
		estions reflec			2	17	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1241	4.60	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
				what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	***	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
		system clearl			1	6	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	154/1427	4.84	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.80
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	1008/1447	4.54	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	10	8	4.26	623/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.26
		Lectur	٩															
1 Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	11	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	941/1387	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.36
		n the subject	12	0	1	0	0	0	9		1055/1387		4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60		
		_	12	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60			4.47		4.32	4.60		
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	0	1	8	4.89	,		4.43	4.32	4.31	4.89
			12 12	1 4	2	0	0	0			895/1193				3.99			
			_															
1 5'1 1		Discus			1.0	0	-	•	-	-	0	2 60	/1100	2 60	2 06	4 1 5	2 05	als als als als
				what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	2		****/1172		3.96	4.15	3.95	****
				d to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	,		4.34	4.35	4.18	4.50
				d open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	3		****/1170		4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succe	sstul		17	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	***
		Labora	_															
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back <u>s</u>	ground information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld experi	ience contribu	te to wh	nat you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
	_			uation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
		Self	Daced															
1. Did se	elf-paced s	~ ~ ~ ~		what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
		cts with the i			21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	***
				Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i or	า									
		Cum. GPA	_	.01107	210													
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors			
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	1			1	9	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh		
				P 9									respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: PHED 123 1

Sports Officiating

Title Moore, Jeffrey M

Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 14

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1075 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1447	4.62	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	89/1447	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.70	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.58	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.59	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	150/1316	4.78	4.36	4.14	3.99	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1427	4.92	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1447	4.69	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1434	4.11	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.92	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.33
Discussion	_	0	-	0	0	0		2 06	020/1150	2 06	2 06	4 15	2 05	2 06
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	830/1172	3.86	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	979/1182	3.83	4.34	4.35	4.18	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.83	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	^^^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	18/ 38	4.80	4.80	4.49	3.83	4.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.52	3.84	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.64	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	3.73	5.00
0.15 7														
Self Paced  1. Did golf-paged gygtem centribute to what you learned	1 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 31	****	****	1 70	/ EO	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12 12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.72 4.57	4.50 4.38	****
<ol> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****
3. Here there chough proceeds for all the schueits		_	J	J	J	J	_	5.00	/ 15			1.01	1.01	

Course-Section: PHED 123 1

Title Sports Officiating

Instructor: Enrollment: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Moore, Jeffrey M Spring 2010

Page 1075 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	 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	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	5			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1076

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHED 133 01

38

Walking/Jogging

Jancuska JR, Joh

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	. aain na	General insights,skil		thia governo	0	0	2	2	6	7	4	2 /2	1356/144	7 3.87	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.43
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	,		4.41	4.27	4.10	4.67
		estions reflect			0	15	0	0	0	2	4	4.67			4.70	4.33	4.25	4.67
		ations reflect			0	15	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	,		4.58	4.24	4.15	4.50
				at you learned	1	15	0	0	0	2	3		****/135		4.59	4.11	4.03	****
	-	-		what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	2	3		****/131		4.36	4.14	3.99	****
		system clearly		-	1	4	0	0	0	3	13		147/142		4.61	4.19	4.24	4.81
		vas class cance			1	0	0	0		12	7		1223/144		4.25	4.69	4.68	4.30
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	3	2	1	0	2	12	1	3.75	1088/143	4 4.14	4.11	4.10	4.10	3.75
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	-	_	4 06	006/120	7 4 00	4 40	4 46	1 16	4 06
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear				14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	- ,		4.40	4.46	4.46	4.86
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				14 14	0	0	0	1 0	1 1	5 6		1081/138		4.52	4.73	4.71	4.57
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	4	4.86	194/138 463/138		4.47 4.43	4.32	4.32	4.86
						3	0	0	0	1	2		****/119			4.32		4.0/
5. Did auc						3	U	U	U	1	2	4.07	/119	3	4.14	4.02	3.99	
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contribu	ate to wh	at you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/117	2 ****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were al	ll student	s actively end	couraged	to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/118	2 ****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage i	air and	open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/117	0 ****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	ssful		20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	0 ****	4.00	4.06	3.95	***
		Field V				_												
		lence contribut			20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3		4.80	4.49	3.83	****
_	_	understand you			20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3		5.00	4.25	4.26	****
		or available f			20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 2		5.00	4.52	3.84	****
		could you discu help you carry			20 20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3 ****/ 2		4.50 5.00	4.30	3.64 3.73	****
5. Dia coi	iterences	neip you carry	out lie	iu activities	20	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 2	,	3.00	4.43	3.73	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
Omodita Ta	a man a d	Cum CDA		Ermogtod Creder				Do-					m	mo			Modern	
E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								sons				1	ype 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	3	Gradua	te	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	L			1	3	Under-	grad :	21	Non-	major	21
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1		Means :			_	h
				P 15								_	respon	ses to 1	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHED 133 03 University of Maryland Title Walking/Jogging Alexander,Krist

Baltimore County

Spring 2010

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 26

Instructor:

Page 1077 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

·				
Ctudent	('011760	Evaluation	Olipetio	nnaira

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	2	5	16	4.32	800/1447	3.87	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	23	4.77	238/1447	4.72	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1241	4.79	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	93/1402	4.70	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	92/1427	4.85	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0		14	7		1275/1447	4.26	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	328/1434	4.14	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	4.93	4.40	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.52	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1386	4.93	4.47	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1380	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 133 03
Title Walking/Jogging
Instructor: Alexander,Krist

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1077 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	11			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		-	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 1078
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

Course-Section: PHED 137 01

Tennis

31

Steil,Oliver

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

		Ouestion	2.0		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
		Question	.15		NK	INA						Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	a ]															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		om this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	980/1447	4.22	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.14
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	327/1447	4.68	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.68
		estions reflec			1	14	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.82	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.75
		ations reflect			1	13	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	437/1402	4.74	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.56	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments conti	ribute t	to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.36	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was th	e grading	g system clear!	ly expla	ined	1	6	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	147/1427	4.60	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.81
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		1	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	1182/1447	4.07	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	600/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.29
		Lectu	_															
		actor's lecture			11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67				4.46	4.46	4.67
		ctor seem inter		_	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/1387	4.82	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.83
				explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1386	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.83
		es contribute t		-	11	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	143/1380	4.85	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	11	8	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1193	4.57	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
		Discus							•	_	_		450/4450					4 0 -
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	6		152/1172		3.96	4.15	3.95	4.86
				ed to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1			,		4.34		4.18	4.86
		_		nd open discussion	16 16	3	0	0	0	1	б 3	4.86	275/1170 ****/ 800		4.23	4.38	4.17	4.86
4. were s	pecial te	echniques succe	essiui		Τ6	3	U	U	U	Τ	3	4./5	^^^^/ 800		4.00	4.06	3.95	^ ^ ^ ^
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ıjor	s	2	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B 0 C 0		<b>a</b>	nera:	1			-	2	TTro-dio		12	Mar		22
56-83 84-150	0		1	C 0		Ger	iera.	Т			1	.3	Under-g	Lau 2	23	NOU-	major	23
84-150 Grad.	10 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 10	D 0 F 0		רים.	ectiv	a				1	#### - 1	Moona +	horo o	ro not	onous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	10	P 14		ъ⊥€	CLIV	ves				1	response				_	111
				I 0		O+1	ner					1	response	a LU L	e sign	ııııdı		
				Δ 0		OCI	101					_						

? 0

Tennis

Course-Section: PHED 137 02 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Instructor: Hubbard, Robert Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1079

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	14	4.38	742/1447	4.22	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	249/1447	4.68	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1241	4.82	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1402	4.74	4.58	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	409/1358	4.56	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1316	4.67	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	7	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	361/1427	4.60	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	1346/1447	4.07	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	230/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	566/1387	4.61	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.82	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	253/1386	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	204/1380	4.85	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	Ü	0	1	1	5	4.57	243/1193	4.57	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	925/1172	4.26	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	691/1182	4.60	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	710/1170	4.60	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 137 02 Title Tennis

Tennis Hubbard, Robert

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 22

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1079 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	7			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 1080
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHED 137 03

Tennis

30

Steil,Oliver

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

Frequencies Instructor Course De Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Me			Sect Mean
General	0 4 21	4 10	4 1 4
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 2 4 4 11 4.14 971/1447 4.22 3. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 6 14 4.62 413/1447 4.68 4.		4.18 4.30	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 6 14 $4.62$ $413/1447$ $4.68$ $4.$ 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 16 0 0 0 1 4 $4.80$ ****/1241 $4.82$ $4.$		4.25	4.02 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 15 0 0 0 1 4 $4.80$ $6.66$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $6.07$ $6.07$ $6.07$ $6.0$		4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 17 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/1358 4.56 4.		4.13	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 17 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1316 4.67 4.		3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 9 0 0 3 1 8 4.42 582/1427 4.60 4.		4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 1 6 9 4 3.80 1414/1447 4.07 4.		4.68	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 2 0 1 7 5 3.87 1010/1434 4.27 4.		4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness / 0 2 0 1 / 3 3.07 1010/1434 4.27 4.	1 4.10	4.10	3.07
Lecture			
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 12 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 798/1387 4.61 4.	0 4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 1 0 10 4.82 758/1387 4.82 4.		4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 483/1386 4.75 4.		4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 312/1380 4.85 4.		4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 5 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1193 4.57 4.			****
of the data committee committee committees and the committees are committeed as a committee of the committees and committees are committees are committees and committees are committees are committees and committees are committees are committees are committees and committees are committees are committees are committees are committees and committees are committees are committees are committees are committees and committees are committees and committees are committeed and committees are committees are committees are committees are committees are committees and committees are committees are committees are committees are committees are committeed and committees are committees are committees are committees are committeed and committees are committeed and committees are committees are committees are committeed and committees are committees are committees are committees are committeed and committees are committeed and committees are committeed and committees are committees are committees are committees a	1 1.02	3.,,,	
Discussion			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1172 4.26 3.	6 4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1182 4.60 4.		4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1170 4.60 4.	3 4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 800 **** 4.	0 4.06	3.95	***
Frequency Distribution			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	J	Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0	Majo	 r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	,		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 13 Under-grad 22	Non-	major	22
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 5 D 0			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means ther	are not	enoug	h
P 13 responses to be s	gnifican	t	
I 0 Other 1	_		
? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 139 1 University of Maryland Page 1081
Title Coed Crew Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Foard, Renee M Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 22

	Ouestionnaire

Questionnaires: 18

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.44	667/1447	4.44	2 00	4.31	1 10	1 11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4 1	2	12 13	4.44	479/1447		3.88 4.41	4.31	4.18	4.44 4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	658/1241		4.70	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	6	4.57			4.70	4.24	4.15	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	0	0	0		****/1358		4.59	4.11	4.13	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	0	1		****/1316		4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	11	1	1	0	1	1		1110/1427		4.61	4.19		3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	1	0	6	9		1132/1447		4.25	4.69		4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	6		540/1434				4.10	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	U	U	U	4	4	0	4.33	340/1434	4.33	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387		4.52	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	558/1386		4.47	4.32	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	1	0	1	2		****/1193			4.02	3.99	****
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.96	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
										- 				
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ge	nera:	L				5	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		El	ectiv	res				5	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 6									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0		Ot	her					1						
? 1														

Course-Section: PHED 144 01
Title Soccer (Outdoor)
Instructor: Caringi,Peter A

30

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1082 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

G . 1 .	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionna	ııre

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	
		~ ~ ~																
1 544		Genera	_		11	0	0	1	1	_	11	1 11	667/1447	4 1 5	2 00	1 21	1 10	1 11
_	_	ew insights,ski ctor make clear			11	0	0	1	U T	2	11 12	4.44	667/1447 479/1447		3.88 4.41	4.31	4.18	4.44 4.56
		uestions reflec			12	12	0	0	0	2	3		****/1241	****	4.70	4.27	4.25	****
		uations reflect			11	10	0	0	1	2	4	4.38	645/1402		4.70	4.24	4.15	4.38
				what you learned	12	13	0	0	0	2	2		****/1358		4.59	4.11	4.03	****
	_	-		o what you learned	13	13	0	0	1	2	0		****/1316		4.36	4.14	3.99	****
		g system clearl		-	12	7	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	154/1427		4.61	4.19	4.24	4.80
		was class canc		illea	12	0	0	0	1	14	2		1346/1447		4.25	4.69	4.68	4.06
	-			hing effectiveness	16	1	0	0	0	4	8		230/1434		4.11	4.10	4.10	4.67
J. 110W W	outa you	grade the overa	II ceac	uing effectiveness	10		U	U	U	-	O	1.07	230/1434	1.55	4.11	4.10	4.10	1.07
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	24	0	0	0	0	Λ	5	5 00	****/1387	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.46	****
		ctor seem inter			22	0	0	0	0	0	7		****/1387		4.52	4.73	4.71	****
				xplained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	0	6		****/1386		4.47	4.32	4.32	****
		es contribute t		-	23	0	0	0	0	1	5		****/1380		4.43	4.32	4.31	****
				our understanding	26	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/1193		4.14	4.02	3.99	****
J. Dia a	aarovibaa.	r ccciniiqueb cii	nance j	our underbeamaring	20	_	O	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 1100			1.02	3.55	
		Discus	sion															
1 Did c	lagg dige			what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
				d to participate	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1182		4.34	4.35	4.18	****
				d open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1170		4.23	4.38	4.17	****
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 800		4.00	4.06	3.95	****
1. Wele i	opeciai e	comingues succes	DDIGI		20	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 555		1.00	1.00	3.75	
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0									2_3.3.3.00	-	-	) •		-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				8	Under-g	rad 2	19	Non-	major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								-			-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.30	-	P 6								-	respons				_	,
	- · ·			= *		Ot.1	her					0	_ 1550115		- 5151			
				? 0								-						

Course-Section: PHED 144 02 Title

Soccer (Outdoor)

Instructor: Adams, Anthony M

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 13 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1083 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	aniei	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1206/1447	4.15	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	500/1447	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1402	4.38	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	181/1427	4.79	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1396/1447	3.99	4.25	4.69	4.68	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	849/1434	4.33	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4 00	1176/1387	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387		4.52	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	2		1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	0	0			****/1193	****	4.14		3.99	****
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	,	2	U	_	U	U		3.30	/11/5		1.11	1.02	3.99	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	12	Ü	O	Ü	Ü	O	_	3.00	, 100			1.20	1.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****			3.73	****
		_	-	_	-	_	_		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 144 02
Title Soccer (Outdoor

Title Soccer (Outdoor)
Instructor: Adams, Anthony M

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1083 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: PHED 164 1 Baltimore County Waterpolo Cradock, Chad G

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

33

University of Maryland Page 1084 JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	859/1447	4.27	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1402	****	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.89	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1060/1447	4.53	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.77	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387		4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	4		1143/1387	4.50	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	431/1386		4.47	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1024/1172	3.40	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1100/1170	3.40	4.23	4.38	4.17	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	***	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 164 1 Title Waterpolo Cradock, Chad G

Instructor: Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Page 1084 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Majors	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5 5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	7			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 202 1 University of Maryland Title

Intro To Health Behavi Baltimore County Spring 2010 Instructor: Hammond, Jessica

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

84-150

Grad.

1

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

D

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	

Page 1085

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Question	S						ncie			Inct	ructor				Level	Sect
					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Mean			Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1222/1447	3.82	3.88	4.31	4.31	3.82
2. Did	the instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1247/1447	3.71	4.41	4.27	4.23	3.71
3. Did	the exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	896/1241	4.06	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.06
4. Did	other evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	943/1402	4.06	4.58	4.24	4.24	4.06
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	772/1358	4.06	4.59	4.11	4.12	4.06
6. Did	written ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.36	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	1	0	6	6	3	3.63	1219/1427	3.63	4.61	4.19	4.14	3.63
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1346/1447	4.06	4.25	4.69	4.70	4.06
9. How	would you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1175/1434	3.63	4.11	4.10	3.97	3.63
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1207/1387	3.94	4.40	4.46	4.42	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	1268/1387	4.24	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.24		
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.47	4.32	4.24	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1074/1380	3.94	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.94
5. Did	audiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	602/1193	4.12	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.12
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	302/1172	4.64	3.96	4.15	4.12	4.64
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	460/1182	4.64	4.34	4.35	4.30	4.64
		_	_	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	687/1170	4.36	4.23	4.38	4.32	4.36
		echniques succe			6	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.01	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Farned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	ason	c			Ту	ne			Majors	•
CI EUILS	, Earnea	Cuiii. GPA	· 	Expected Grades				1/60									a JUL 8	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajors	3	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera:	L				6	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17

Electives

Other

1

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant