Title JOGGING

Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 22

84-150

Grad.

9

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

3

D

F

P 13

I

?

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1257 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							_							_				
		0			NTD	373		eque			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	3 		NR 	NA	1	2	3	-4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	1															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	8	3	5	2	4		1637/1669		3.81	4.23	4.02	2.59
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	1	16	4.45	620/1666	4.19	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.45
	_	uestions reflect			0	18	0	1	0	0	3		****/1421		4.53	4.24	4.11	****
		uations reflect		_	0	19	0	2	0	0	1		****/1617		4.11	4.15	3.99	****
	_	-		what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	0	0		****/1555		3.92	4.00	3.92	****
		-		to what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	0	0		****/1543		3.75	4.06	3.86	***
	_	g system clearly		ained	0	5	0	0	0	2	15		123/1647		4.46	4.12	4.06	4.88
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	21	1		1508/1668		4.17	4.67	4.62	4.05
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	10	3	3.79	1187/1605	3.97	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.79
		Lecture	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.40
		ctor seem intere			11	0	1	0	1	0	9		1231/1551		4.57	4.66	4.55	4.45
				explained clearly	12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.40
		es contribute to			12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.40
		Diegue	gion															
1 Did al	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn.						0	0	2	0	4	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.73	4.05	3.85	4.33
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned were all students actively encouraged to participat						1	0	0	0	6	4.43	729/1502		3.99	4.26	4.06	4.43
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi						1	0	0	0	5	4.33	865/1489		4.05	4.29		4.33
					16													
		Laborat	_															
_	_	_		kground information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
		structor provide			21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were r	equireme	nts for lab repo	orts c	learly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	e clear	r	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
		Field V	Work															
1. Did fi	eld expe			what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.00	***
				luation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	3.81	***
		ctor available			20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	***
		could you disc			20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	***	****	3.97	4.00	***
		_	_															
1 Did co	lf-naced	Self I		what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
	 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned Did study questions make clear the expected goal 							0	0	0	1		****/ 42	***	****	4.31	4.08	****
	1 1	-	21	-	0	-		-			,							
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						Red	quir	ed f	or M	aior	 s 1	9	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	 0
28-55	В 1			-1 ~ -1 .)		-	or adda c	-	-		-	3			
56-83	0 2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 3	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	-major	22
04 150	_								-)				

Electives

Other

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Title JOGGING Instructor: WARNER, ROBERT

Course Section: PHED 109 0201

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 14

JAN	18,	2007
Job	IRBI	R3029

Page 1258

			Fre	eauei	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	2	2	2	2	6	3.57	1449/1669	3.08	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1206/1666	4.19	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.53	4.24	4.11	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1555	***	3.92	4.00	3.92	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1543	***	3.75	4.06	3.86	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	651/1647	4.64	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1170/1668	4.29	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	810/1605	3.97	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1514	4.40	4.35	4.39	4.32	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1551		4.57	4.66	4.55	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1503		4.46	4.24	4.17	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1506		4.42	4.26	4.17	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1490 4.33 3.73 4.05 3.85 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	5			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: PHED 111 0101 Page 1259 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: DARCANGELO, MIC Fall 2006

Enrollment:	37				
Questionnaires:	24	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions						Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question				NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	3	0	9	5	7	3.54	1462/1669	3.34	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.54
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	984/1666	4.06	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.17
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	2	21	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	21	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1617	3.17	4.11	4.15	3.99	***
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0		0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	10	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	617/1647	4.18	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.43
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	1	3	10	9	4.04	1508/1668	4.16	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.04
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll tea	ching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	5	5	6	3.60	1312/1605	3.46	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1292/1514	3.85	4.35	4.39	4.32	3.85
2. Did th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	1168/1551	4.54	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.54
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	12	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.33
4. Did th	he lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	11	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	12	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1311	3.50	3.93	3.85	3.68	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	***
				ed to participate		0							****/1502					****
		_	_	nd open discussion	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****
1						7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Re	ason	.s			Ty	ре			Majors	5
														_				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
FC 02	1	2 00 2 00	2	a 0		0		1				1	TTen el a sa		1	Mare		2.4

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	17			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 111 0201 University of Maryland Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING Baltimore County SINGELTON, TARA Fall 2006

Instructor: Enrollment: 36

Ouestionnaires: 21

Page 1260 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	3	4	4	7	3	3.14	1583/1669	3.34	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1164/1666	4.06	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.95
2 Did the even mentions reflect the evented scale	Λ	10	Λ	Λ	2	Λ	1	2 67	****/1/101	****	4 E2	1 21	1 11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67 ****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	4	0	1	3.17 1492/1617	3.17	4.11	4.15	3.99	3.17
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 ****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	2	0	0	2.33 ****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	2	0	1	6	6	3.93 1125/1647	4.18	4.46	4.12	4.06	3.93
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29 1364/1668	4.16	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.29
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	8	4	2	3.31 1436/1605	3.46	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.31

Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75 ****/1514	3.85	4.35	4.39	4.32	****
2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	Λ	0	1	Λ	1	2	4 20 ****/1EE1	1 [1	1 57	1 66	/ EE	****

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20 ****/1551	4.54	4.57	4.66	4.55	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50 ****/1503	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.17	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00 ****/1506	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50 939/1311	3.50	3.93	3.85	3.68	3.50

.uı	cccimingacs	cimanice y	Our	anacibeanaing	13	0	_	U	_	5	_	3.30	737/1311	3.30	5.75	5.05	3.00	3.30
	Dis	cussion																

2200002001													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00 ****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00 ****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****
		_	_		_	_		0 =0/4.400		4 0 =			

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/1489 **** 4.05 4.29 4.07 ****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	15	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	21	Non-major	21
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	14			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 112 0101 University of Maryland BEGINNING SWIMMING Baltimore County GARNER, JOSH

10

0

Ι

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

21

Page 1261 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

1

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnair	e
---------	--------	------------	--------------	---

						Frequencies						Inst	tructor	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 you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	7	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	1124/1669	4.07	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.07
_	_	tor make clear			7	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.71
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	7	12	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	7	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	7	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	7	12	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	/ expla	ained	7	6	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.50
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		7	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.20
		Lecture	_															
1 Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture:		prepared	18	0	1	0	1	Ο	1	3 00	****/1514	****	4.35	4.39	4.32	****
		tor seem inter			16	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/1551	****	4.57	4.66	4.55	****
				explained clearly	16	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/1503	****	4.46	4.24	4.17	****
		es contribute to			16	2	0	0	2	0	_		****/1506		4.42	4.26	4.17	****
				our understanding	15	4	0	0	2	0			****/1311		3.93		3.68	****
		Discus					_			_	_							
				what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/1490			4.05	3.85	****
				ed to participate	19	0	0 1	0	1	0	1		****/1502 ****/1489		5.77	4.26	4.06	****
3. Dia the	e instruc	ctor encourage	air ar	nd open discussion	19	0	1	U	U	0	Τ	3.00	^^^^/1489	^^^	4.05	4.29	4.07	^ ^ ^ ^
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	rnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Por	aana				Ту	00			Majors	
creares Ea	armed	Cuill. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons							ту.	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majo					jors	3	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	:1	Non-	major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t			_	h

Other

Course Section: PHED 113 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County INTERMEDIATE SWIMMING GIBEAU, CHRISTO Fall 2006

Ρ

I

?

12

0

Enrollment: 14

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Me	
guescions with NA 1 2 5 1 5 Medit Rain Medit Med	n Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 0 0 1 1 1 1 10 4.29 876/1669 4.29 3.81 4.23 4.	2 4 20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.79 206/1666 4.79 4.26 4.19 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 466/1421 4.60 4.53 4.24 4.	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 496/1617 4.50 4.11 4.15 3. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 12 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1555 **** 3.92 4.00 3.	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/1543 **** 3.92 4.00 3.	_
·	•
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 334/1647 4.64 4.46 4.12 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 1087/1668 4.64 4.17 4.67 4.	
	6 4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 188/1605 4.73 4.10 4.07 3.	5 4.73
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1514 5.00 4.35 4.39 4.	2 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.57 4.66 4.	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.57 4.00 4.	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 225/1506 4.86 4.42 4.26 4.	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 97/1311 4.86 3.93 3.85 3.	
3. Did audiovisual techniques emance your understanding / 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 9//1311 4.00 3.93 3.03 3.	5 4.00
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1490 **** 3.73 4.05 3.	5 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1502 **** 3.99 4.26 4.	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1489 **** 4.05 4.29 4.	
4. Were special techniques successful 12 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.91 4.00 3.	
1. Here Special teetiniques successful	_
Frequency Distribution	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Maj	rs
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 11 Graduate 0 Major	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 14 Non-maj	r 14
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not en	ugh

Other

Page 1262

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Course Section: PHED 121 0101 University of Maryland Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County

PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County JANCUSKA JR, JO Fall 2006

Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 20

Page 1263 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	781/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	206/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.90	4.53	4.24	4.11	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1543	3.80	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	232/1647	4.80	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1305/1668	4.31	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	617/1605	4.31	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.31
Lecture	11	0	^	^	0	0	0	F 00	1/1514	1 00	4 25	4 20	4 20	г оо
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1514	4.96	4.35	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00		4.24	4.17	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1506	4.83		4.26	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.93	3.85	3.68	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	3.99	4.26	4.06	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.05	4.29	4.07	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
		_	-	-	-	Ü	-	00	, 5,					

Course Section: PHED 121 0101 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Instructor:

JANCUSKA JR, JO

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1263 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	dits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	10	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	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	12			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Instructor: BARROQUEIRO, MI Enrollment: 45

Course Section: PHED 121 0201

Questionnaires: 29

I	age	1264
JAN	18,	2007
Job	IRBE	R3029

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5		tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		 Genera																
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	2	0	2	8	16	4.29	876/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	3	22	4.55	494/1666		4.26	4.19	4.11	4.55
		uestions reflec			0	27	0	0	0	0	2		****/1421		4.53	4.24	4.11	****
	_	uations reflect			1	23	0	0	0	1	4		****/1617		4.11	4.15	3.99	****
				what you learned	1	26	0	0	0	1	1		****/1555		3.92	4.00	3.92	****
	_	-		o what you learned	0	19	1	1	1	3	4		1101/1543		3.75	4.06	3.86	3.80
		g system clearl			2	6	0	0	0	2	19		112/1647		4.46	4.12	4.06	4.90
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	3	18	8	4.17	1431/1668	4.31	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.17
				hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	358/1605	4.31	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.52
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.96	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.88
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	21	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	22	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	****
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	642/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1490		3.73	4.05	3.85	****
	re all students actively encouraged to participa				25	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1502		3.99	4.26	4.06	****
				d open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1489		4.05	4.29	4.07	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	sstul		26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****
1 513 61		Field		1	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** / FC	****	4 06	4 00	4 00	****
				hat you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58 ****/ 52		4.86	4.22	4.00	****
				uation criteria	28 28	0 0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52 ****/ 39		4.57	4.06 4.39	3.81 4.30	****
		ctor available could you disc			28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40		****	3.97	4.30	****
				ield activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30		****	4.33	4.30	****
5. Dia co	nirerence	s help you carr	y out I	ield activities	20	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 30	,		4.33	4.30	
1 Did se	alf-naced	Self		what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 55	; ****	****	4.34	4.17	****
		acts with the i			28	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46		****	4.45	4.26	****
J. Were y	our come	accs with the i	iib er de e	-		-		-	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 10	,		1.15	1.20	
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.9	Graduat	:e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-9	grad 2	29	Non-	-major	29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 22		0.13					_	respons	ses to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt		

Other

4

I 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1265

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: PHED 121 0301

PHYSICAL FITNESS

PEDERGNANA, ALE

Title

Instructor:

						$Fr\epsilon$	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	: Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	3	1	5	2	5	3.31	1547/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.31
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.67
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1617	4.56	4.11	4.15	3.99	***
5. Did ass	igned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	***
				o what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	3.80	3.75	4.06	3.86	***
. Was the	grading	system clearl	v expla	ined	1	7	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	213/1647	4.80	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.75
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1297/1668		4.17	4.67	4.62	4.38
				hing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	3		857/1605		4.10		3.96	
		- .																
Were th	e instru	Lectur ctor's lecture		nrenared	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	4 96	4.35	4 39	4.32	5.00
		tor seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551		4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00
				xplained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1503		4.46	4.24		5.00
		eriai presence s contribute t			12	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1506				4.17	
. Dia the	recture	s contribute t	O WIIAL	you rearned	12	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/1500	4.03	4.42	4.20	4.1/	5.00
. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	***
. Were al	l studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1502	3.67	3.99	4.26	4.06	***
. Did the	instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	4.20	4.05	4.29	4.07	***
. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****
		Semina	r															
. Was the	instruc		_	ividual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4			 quire				 a 1	2	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1/6/	14116	.u _ (J⊥ 1*10	וטנג	υ I	۷.	Graduat	_	U	Majc) <u>.</u>	U
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Co	neral					1	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non	-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	ici al	L				_	onder -g	rau I	.0	NOII-	iiia JUI	Τ0
	0		5	ъ 0 F 0		. רקד	- 4 + 4 -					0	инии ,	Maana +	homo -			~h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	5	F U		FT6	ectiv	/es				U	#### - 1				_	ATT
						0-1						2	respons	es to E	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				I 0		ULI	ner					3						
				? 0														

Course Section: PHED 123 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Fall 2006

SPORTS OFFICIATING Instructor: PHILYAW, KEVIN

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 17

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1266 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions						_	ncies				tructor		_	UMBC		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne		s from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	719/166	9 4.41	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.41
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	385/166	6 4.65	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.65
			the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/142	1 ****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect th	ne expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	1029/161	7 4.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute	e to what you learned	0	10	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1287/155	5 3.43	3.92	4.00	3.92	3.43
			ate to what you learned	0	5	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1372/154	3 3.17	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.17
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly e	explained	0	3	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	401/164	7 4.57	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.57
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancell	led	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	1394/166	8 4.24	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.24
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	800/160	5 4.15	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.15
		Lecture															
		actor's lectures v		0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1130/151	4 4.18	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.18
			ted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/155	1 4.88	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.88
		_	and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5		4.47	604/150		4.46	4.24	4.17	4.47
		es contribute to v		0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	623/150	6 4.53	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.53
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enhar	nce your understanding	0	9	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	445/131	1 4.25	3.93	3.85	3.68	4.25
		Discussion															
			e to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	604/149		3.73	4.05	3.85	4.36
		_	uraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	8			1148/150		3.99	4.26	4.06	3.86
		_	ir and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2		4.43			4.05	4.29	4.07	4.43
4. Were s	pecial te	tul	3	6	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	447/100	6 4.13	3.91	4.00	3.81	4.13	
0 17	Laboratory				0	0	0	0	0	0	F 00	**** / 00		****	4 10	4 00	****
2. were y	ou provid	ded with adequate	background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	3 ^^^^	* * * *	4.19	4.09	
1 1/10		Seminar	- +b	1 /	2	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 11	2 ****	****	4.38	4 04	****
i. were a	.ssignea (lopics relevant to	o the announced theme	14	2	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/ 11	۷		4.38	4.04	****
		Field Wor															
	_		to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	28/ 5		4.86	4.22	4.00	4.86
_	_	·	evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	22/ 5		4.57	4.06	3.81	4.57
		ctor available for		11	2	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 3		****	4.39	4.30	****
	_	_	s your evaluations	11	3	0	0	0	1	2	2.0/	****/ 4		****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did co	nterences	s help you carry o	out field activities	11	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 3	0 ****	****	4.33	4.30	****
		Self Pac															
	_	_	e to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 5	_	****	4.34	4.17	****
		cions make clear t		14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4		****	4.31	4.08	****
_		acts with the inst	_	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	1.50	****/ 4	6 ****	****	4.45	4.26	****
		ck/tutoring by pro	_	14	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 3		****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for a	all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 2	9 ****	****	4.34	4.22	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Re	asons	5			Т	уре			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					 quir	 ed f	 or Ma	 ajor	s 1	.3	 Gradua	 te	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	О В О														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5 C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-	grad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0														
~ 1		2 50 4 00 (•						

Electives

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ 10

0

I 0 Other 5 ?

Course Section: PHED 125 0201 University of Maryland Title VOLLEYBALL Baltimore County Instructor: BEALL, J Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

29

University of Maryland Page 1267
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	719/1669	4.42	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1438/1668	4.17	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.57	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	rades Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	3	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	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	6			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	0						

Course Section: PHED 125A 0101 University of Maryland Title

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned

2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria

Field Work

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: BLANCHARD, IAN

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	31

Page 1268 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				~			alle							
			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	3	20	4.37	781/1669	4.37	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	20	4.50	549/1666		4.26	4.19	4.11	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	10	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	313/1647	4.65	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	1106/1668	4.62	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	298/1605	4.61	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	763/1514	4 53	4.35	4 39	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/1551		4.57	4.66	4.55	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	_	13	4.87	163/1503		4.46	4.24	4.17	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	15		115/1506		4.42	4.26	4.17	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	2	7	4.09	812/1490	4.09	3.73	4.05	3.85	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.09	237/1502		3.99	4.26	4.06	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	467/1489		4.05	4.29	4.07	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	1	0	0	1	4		****/1006		3.91	4.00	3.81	****
1. Wele special eccuniques successful	20	3	_	O	O	_	-	1.1/	71000		3.71	1.00	3.01	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														

30 0 0 Frequency Distribution

30 0 0

30 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 ****

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.86 4.22 4.00 ****

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.57 4.06 3.81 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	14			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Page 1269
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

3

	Evaluation	

Course Section: PHED 133 0101

40

WALKING/JOGGING

JANCUSKA JR, JO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

							Fr	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.33
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.92	4.00	3.92	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	3.86	5.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.89
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.60
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.50
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					7	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	958/1506	4.20	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.20
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.73	4.05	3.85	3.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.99	4.26	4.06	3.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.05	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	***	3.91	4.00	3.81	****
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	rib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4										 6	Craduat		0	Mo ic			
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 0		Rec	quir	eu I	or Ma	ijors	j.	O	Graduat	е	U	Majo	Σ	0
26-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0			Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-2.99	4	D 0	General						U	onder -9	ruu 1	۷.	INOII	ila jui	14	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves		0 #### - Means there are n		re not	enous	ıh				
orua.	91au. 0 3.30-4.00 1 r 0									-	respons				_	,		
				1 0									TCDPOILD		5191	cai		

Other

I

?

0

0

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Course Section: PHED 139 0101

13

COED CREW

FOARD, RENEE M.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1270

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1669	4.85	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	231/1666	4.77	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.29	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	313/1605	4.58	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1160/1514	4.13	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	1	3		1180/1503		4.46	4.24	4.17	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1311/1490	3.13	3.73	4.05	3.85	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	1428/1502	2.88	3.99	4.26	4.06	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1441/1489	2.75	4.05	4.29	4.07	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	322/1006	4.38	3.91	4.00	3.81	4.38

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	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	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	10			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 146 0101 University of Maryland Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT Baltimore County

Page 1271 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: ANDERSON, CORIN

Enrollment:	19
0	11

Ouestionnaires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescionnaires.	± ±	beauciic	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescronnarie

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	M
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 306/1669 4.61 3.81 4.23 4.02 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 549/1666 4.45 4.26 4.19 4.11 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.53 4.24 4.11 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.11 4.15 3.99	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 549/1666 4.45 4.26 4.19 4.11 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.53 4.24 4.11 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.11 4.15 3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.53 4.24 4.11 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.11 4.15 3.99	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.11 4.15 3.99	4.50
The state of the s	5.00
	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1555 5.00 3.92 4.00 3.92	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1543 5.00 3.75 4.06 3.86	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1647 4.93 4.46 4.12 4.06	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.60 1125/1668 4.80 4.17 4.67 4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 239/1605 4.44 4.10 4.07 3.96	4.67
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1514 **** 4.35 4.39 4.32	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $9 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 2 \ 5.00 ****/1551 **** 4.57 4.66 4.55$	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1503 **** 4.46 4.24 4.17	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1506 **** 4.42 4.26 4.17	***
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1490 **** 3.73 4.05 3.85	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1502 **** 3.99 4.26 4.06	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1489 **** 4.05 4.29 4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successful 10 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1006 **** 3.91 4.00 3.81	****
Frequency Distribution	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 11 Non-major	11
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough	
P 8 responses to be significant	
I 0 Other 3	
? 0	

Course Section: PHED 146 0201 University of Maryland

Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT Baltimore County Fall 2006 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED

?

0

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 10

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

Page 1272

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questions							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	590/1669	4.61	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	691/1666		4.26	4.19	4.11	4.40
		uestions reflec			0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	***
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1617	5.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	****
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1555	5.00	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1647	4.93	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.86
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.80	4.17	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	725/1605	4.44	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.22
		Lectur	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	****	4.35	4.39	4.32	****
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1551	****	4.57	4.66	4.55	****
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1503	****	4.46	4.24	4.17	****
		es contribute t			9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1506	****	4.42	4.26	4.17	****
				our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1311		3.93	3.85	3.68	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	ace dieci			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1502		3.99	4.26	4.06	****
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1489		4.05	4.29	4.07	****
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1006			4.00	3.81	****
				Frequ	anas	, Diet	trib	ıt i o	n									
				riequ	terrey	DIS	CIID	acio.										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 S	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55							-			-						3 -		
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																	-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
P 7													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	her					1						

Course Section: PHED 202 0101 University of Maryland

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 47

Questionnaires: 40

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1273 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_					_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	4	13	7	12		1467/1669		3.81	4.23	4.34	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	15	15		1082/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	23				4.53	4.24	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	7	11	17		1017/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1 0	2	3	10	8	14		1037/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2 1	0	2	3 2	10 7	14	9		1200/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	6 12	24 23	4.33	759/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12 4.67	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	9	12	23 8	3.97	1289/1668 987/1605	3.59 3.72	4.17	4.67	4.59 4.15	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	U	U	9	12	0	3.97	967/1005	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	10	9	15	4.09	1177/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	8	12	15	4.20	1361/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	6	11	17	4.32	811/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	7	12	13	4.03	1060/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	9	10	14	4.00	587/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	4.11
Discussion		•												
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	8	4	16	4.29	667/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61		4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	5	2	21	4.57	622/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	1	7	3	14	4.08	465/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	4.08
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	,	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
5. 214 Compared help you carry out freta activities	٥,	J	_	J	_	J	_	3.00	, 50			1.33	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	***

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1273 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

OII: FILED 202 0101

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 40

. B) Fall 2006

University of Maryland
Baltimore County

Page 1274 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	q		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	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	1	0	3	4	13	7	12		1467/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	15	15	4.03	1082/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	23	4.41	670/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	7	11	17		1017/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	10	8	14		1037/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	10	14	9		1200/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	24	4.33	759/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	1	12	23		1289/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	820/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	2	2	4	6	4 00	1199/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	1	4	7		1319/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	556/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	693/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26		4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	470/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	4.11
5. Did dadiovibadi ecomiqueb emanee jour anderseanding	20	Ü	J	_	-	-	,	1.21	1,0,1311	3.33	3.75	3.03	3.30	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	8	4	16	4.29	667/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	540/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	5	2	21	4.57	622/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	1	7	3	14	4.08	465/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	4.08
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	2	1	0	1	0	2	3 50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	1	0	2		,	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
or were requirements for run reports eredir, specifica	33	_	Ü	_	_	Ü	-	3.75	, 200			1.15	1.00	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	1	0	1		,	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
		-	-	-	-	-	_		, 30					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	,	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 40 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1274 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	 19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	13					
				?	0							

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor: JONES, KHADIJA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 32

Fall 2006

Baltimore County

Page 1275

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fr	eane	ncie	g		Tngi	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	10	10	4	1	2.44	1654/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	2.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	13	8	2	3.00	1578/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1170/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	15	5	4	3.06	1506/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	3	13	6	3	2.97	1444/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	2.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	8	9	7	1		1503/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	2.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	7	12	5			1526/1647			4.12	4.19	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	6	9	10	5			1661/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	2.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	7	6	4	2	0	2.05	1583/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	10	9	9	1	2	2 22	1496/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	3.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	7	8	8	7	1		1550/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	3.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	8	8	6	_		1432/1503	4.09		4.24	4.29	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	12	1	9	5			1465/1506			4.24		3.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	7	3	3	2			1269/1311				3.96	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	,	3	3	2	U	2.00	1209/1311	3.33	3.93	3.03	3.90	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	7	6	4	1	2.52	1429/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	2.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	8	8	4	3.57	1287/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	7	10	3	3.57	1253/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	3	2	6	8	2	3.19	893/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	3.19
T - 1 1														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	2	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.71	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	30	_	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 200			1.13	4.35	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****
7' 11 7' 1														
Field Work	21	^	^	_	-1	^	0	2 00	++++/	****	1 00	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 58		4.86	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31 31	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40		****	3.97	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor: JONES, KHADIJA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 32 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1275 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	 А	23	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

HED 202 0102

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor: (Instructor)

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 32

(Instr. B) Fall

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1276 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_											
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	10	10	4	1		1654/1669		3.81	4.23	4.34	2.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	13	8	2		1578/1666		4.26	4.19	4.29	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	8	10		1170/1421		4.53	4.24	4.35	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	15	5	4		1506/1617		4.11	4.15	4.24	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	3	13	6	3		1444/1555		3.92	4.00	3.96	2.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	8	9	7	1		1503/1543		3.75	4.06	4.10	2.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	7	12	5			1526/1647		4.46	4.12	4.19	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	6	9	10	5			1661/1668		4.17			2.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	918/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	1076/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	3.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	5	8	6		1397/1551		4.57	4.66		3.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	959/1503		4.46	4.24	4.29	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	5	8	5		1204/1506			4.26	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	1	1	4	3	-		1072/1311				3.96	
5. Dia addiovibuai econniques ennance four understanding		O	_	_	-	5	-	3.20	10,2,1311	3.33	3.73	3.03	3.70	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	7	6	4	1	2.52	1429/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	2.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	8	8	4	3.57	1287/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	7	10	3	3.57	1253/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	3	2	6	8	2	3.19	893/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	3.19
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	2	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	30	_	O	O	_	O	Ü	3.00	, 200			1.15	1.35	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00		****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	***
Self Paced	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 55	****	****	1 21	1 67	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0 1	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31 31	0	0	0 1	0 T	0	0	3.00	****/ 46 ****/ 33		****	4.45 4.25	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3 L	U	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00	^^/ 33			4.25	5.00	

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 32 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1276 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	 А	23	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor: LEPUS, JENNIFER

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2006

Page 1277 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	= =					
uestionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	4	12	4 14	1064/1669	3 22	3.81	4 23	4.34	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	620/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	18	4.64	429/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	684/1617		4.11	4.15	4.24	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	408/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	13	4.24	680/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	334/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	2	15	4	3.95	1562/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	473/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	715/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1176/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	537/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	623/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	389/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	261/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	326/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	368/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	360/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	4.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	***	4.34	5.00	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor: LE

LEPUS, JENNIFER

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1277 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	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	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a	
				P	0			responses to	be si	ignificant		
				I	0	Other	12					
				?	0							