Course-Section: PHED 105 0101

Title BASKETBALL

Instructor: STERN, PHIL

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1125 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	auer	cies			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	1	3	3	2	9	3.83	1254/1522	3.83	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1381	4.83	3.91	4.08	3.93	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	149/1500	4.82	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1062/1517	4.53	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	493/1497	4.42	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1298/1432	3.43	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar	1.0	0	^	0	^	^	-	F 00	4444 / 70	****	****	4 50	4 12	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77			4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****		4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 45	****	****	4.41		****
				0			2		, -	****	****		3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17 17	0 0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39 ****/ 35	****	****	4.40 4.31	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 34	****	****		4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	^^^^/ 34	^^^		4.30	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.19	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****
3als energ enough proceeds for all the seadenes	10	3	5	5	J	9	_	5.00	, 10			1.17		

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101
Title BASKETBALL

Title BASKETBALL Instructor: STERN, PHIL

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1125 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	arned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	14			responses to 1	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 109 0201 University of Maryland JOGGING SINGLETON, TARA

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

30

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1126

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

_			and the second second
Ctudant	College	Proplustion	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	1	3	3.17	1475/1522	3.58	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	358/1522	4.72	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam guestions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	٥	2	E 00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	0	0	2		1245/1476		4.41	4.22	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1412		4.41	4.22	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	519/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	3.93	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	630/1500	4.58	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	438/1517	4.46	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	820/1497		4.10	4.11	4.02	4.11
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	O	O	U	2	1	3	1.11	020/110/	1.51	1.10	1.11	1.02	1.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.81	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.81	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.54	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1432	4.19	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	3.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1277	4.25	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1269	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful		1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	***	4.33	4.02	3.87	***
Frequ		Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	-					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	9			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		-	
				2	0						

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301 University of Maryland Page 1127 Title JOGGING JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
		Frequencies
	Onogtiona	мом 1224 в м

Enrollment:

32

			Fre	equer	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	2	0	0	1	7	1	٥	4 00	1122/1522	3.58	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	233/1522	4.72	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.78
	2	14	0	0	0	0	T.2		****/1285	****	4.51	4.20	4.10	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3		0	0	2	1	3 1		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	Τ	4	4.29	758/1476	3.98	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	•	1	0	2		****/1412	4.33	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	Τ	0	1	0			****/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	Τ	0	0	Ţ	2	14	4.76	201/1500	4.58	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	2	14	2		1389/1517	4.46	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	385/1497	4.31	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.81	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.81	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.54	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.19	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	3	Λ	1	Λ	2	3 00	1187/1280	3.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.25
1 3 1	12	0	1	0	7	0	-	4.25	875/1269	4.25		4.34		4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	U	U T	0	2	0	5		,	4.00	4.26		4.04	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	U	U	0	U	3	5.00	****/ 854		4.33	4.02	3.87	****

Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA Exp			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	ors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20	
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า	
				P	10			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	6					
				2	1							

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101 University of Maryland Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING Instructor: CATONE, SCOTT

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1128

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	42		-
Questionnaires:	23	Student Cours	e Evaluation Questionnaire

I 0

?

							Fre	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 Did vo	nı gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	3	7	5	6	3 55	1387/1522	3.64	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.55
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	904/1522		4.34	4.26	4.18	4.23
		uestions reflec			4	17	0	0	0	0	2		****/1285		4.51	4.30	4.22	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	16	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	11	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1034/1381	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.93	3.78
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	5	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	387/1500	4.64	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.60
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	. , .		4.29	4.65	4.62	4.95
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	10	4	3.86	1073/1497	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.86
	Lecture																	
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	0	3		****/1440		4.33	4.45	4.40	****
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1448		4.53	4.71	4.63	****
	B. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl L. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	****
				-	20 17	0 5	0	0	0	1	2		****/1432		4.21	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did au	laiovisua.	ı techniques en	nance y	our understanding	Ι/	5	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	^^^	4.28	3.93	3.86	* * * * *
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dicc			what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	Ο	1	4 00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1277		4.45	4.34	4.13	****
		_	_	d open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1269		4.26	4.31	4.04	****
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbren	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 854		4.33	4.02	3.87	****
						_	-		-	•	_		,					
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	uir	ed fo	or M	ajors	1	5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55											_	-		-	-) <		-
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	23
84-150																	-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 17									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				_								_						

Other

5

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201

AEROBIC CONDITIONING

Title Instructor: CROSS, ROBERT

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 24 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1129 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	2	0	2	3	2	7	8	3.73	1310/1522	3.64	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	5	11	4.05	1058/1522	4.14	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	19	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1381	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	287/1500	4.64	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1241/1517	4.63	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	13	4	4.00	898/1497	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	1	Λ	_	2 00	1262/1440	3.88	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	2	1	0	5		1353/1448	4.00	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	2	0	0	5		1212/1436	3.75	4.31	4.29	4.03	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	2	0	0	4		1251/1430	3.75	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	1	0	2	0	2		****/1221	****	4.21	3.93		****
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10		1	U	۷	U	۷	3.40	/1221		4.20	3.93	3.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	***	4.33	4.02	3.87	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 33		****	4.69	4.57	
5. Here your concaces with the instructor herpful	23	U	J	_	U	U	U	2.00	, 55			1.09	1.57	
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	12			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	Ο						

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

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

18

Spring 2007

Page 1130

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

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

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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1022/1522	4.13	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.00
		uestions reflec		-	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	***
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	***
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	9	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1500	4.83	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.83
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	1	2	7	1	4	3.33	1498/1517	3.33	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.33
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1105/1497	3.82	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.82
		Lectur	Α															
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	10	0	1	0	Λ	3	1	3 60	1345/1440	3.60	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.60
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	3	2		1241/1448	4.40	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.40
				-	11	0	1	0	1	1	1		1350/1436	3.25	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.25
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	1	1		1270/1432		4.21	4.29	4.23	3.50
				our understanding	11 11	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/1221			3.93	3.86	****
		- ·																
1 543		Discus			1 1	0	^	0	1	0	0	2 00	**** /1000	****	2 05	4 10	2 00	****
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	0		****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	14 14	0 0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1277 ****/1269	****	4.45 4.26	4.34	4.13	****
		_		d open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	U		****/ 854		4.26	4.31	3.87	****
4. were s	special t	echniques succe	SSIUI		14	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
														 -	1			
00-27						Re	quir	ea I	or Ma	jors	Τ	4	Graduat	3	1	Majo	r	0
28-55						a		1				0	TTrades		4	Mari		1 -
56-83	56-83					Ge	nera	L				0	Under-g	rau 1	.4	Non-	major	15
						ר יוד	ecti					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	n-+	0200111	-h
Grau.	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					E10	ecrl,	ves				U	respons				_	ìīī
	P 9					O+1	hor					1	respons	es co L	e sign	ıııcaı.	I C	
		I 0 Oth					Other					т						

? 0

Baltimore County

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 26

33

Spring 2007

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101 University of Maryland Page 1131 PHYSICAL FITNESS JUN 26, 2007 WRIGHT, NICCI Job IRBR3029

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

Questions							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did y	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	2	0	5	6	13	4.08	1074/1522	3.68	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.08
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	576/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.48
3. Did t	the exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	2	18	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
		uations reflect			2	19	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	***
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	19	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	***
6. Did w	written ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	1	21	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	***
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	1	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	660/1500	4.46	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.38
8. How m	many times	was class cand	celled		2	0	0	1	0	15	8	4.25	1268/1517	4.20	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.25
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	654/1497	3.92	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.25
		Lectur	re															
1. Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	2	2	6	4.40	931/1440	3.70	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.40
2. Did t	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	1089/1448	4.13	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.58
3. Was l	lecture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	16	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	934/1436	3.81	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.20
4. Did t	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	15	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1126/1432	3.53	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.91
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques er	hance	your understanding	13	8	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did o	class disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	ncourage	ed to participate	20	0	0	0	1		5	4.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	***
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	20	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	***
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	essful		18	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
	Fre						trib	utio	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	ne			Majors	:
Cicuito Baillea Cum. GFA Expected Glades																		, . – – – –
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	s 1	.4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					~		-				_	TT					26

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	11			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201 Title

PHYSICAL FITNESS

BOBB, DAVID O. Instructor:

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 28 Spring 2007

Page 1132 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student (Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
-----------	--------	--------------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	9	8	3	3.04	1486/1522	3.68	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	7	7	6	3.21	1454/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	10	1	2	3	2	10	4.00	988/1500	4.46	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	1	19	5	4.00	1389/1517	4.20	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	4	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1215/1497	3.92	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1404/1440	3.70	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	2	0	2	2	2		1437/1448	4.13	4.53	4.71	4.63	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	2	3	1		1308/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	2	2	1		1350/1432		4.21	4.29	4.23	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	0	0	3	0	0		****/1221		4.28	3.93	3.86	****
5. Dia addisvibual econniques emance four anderseanding	20	3	Ü	Ü	3	J	J	3.00	, 1221		1.20	3.75	3.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	3	0	1		****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	3	0	1		****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	4	0	1		****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 205	***	****	4.23	4.28	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	27	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	, 00			7,11	3.19	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.41	3.90	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****
The second control for the second sec	_ •	_	-	_	-	J	•		, 10					

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Instructor:

BOBB, DAVID O.

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 28 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1132 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	19			responses to	be si	gnificant.	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301 University of Maryland PHYSICAL FITNESS MUMMA, ROBERT S Instructor:

Title

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1133

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	34	
Questionnaires:	27	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions							equei					tructor	Course	_				
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		m this course	2	0	0	3	5	8	9	3.92	1200/1522	3.68	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.92
		ctor make clea:			1	0	0	1	5	5	15		824/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.31
		uestions refle			1	22	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
	_	uations reflec		_	1	21	0	0	0	2	3		****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
				what you learned	0	25	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
				o what you learned	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clear	ly expla	ined	1	8	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1500	4.46	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		1	0	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1209/1517	4.20	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.35
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	4	2	0	0	7	10	4	3.86	1073/1497	3.92	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.86
		Lectu:	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectur	es well	prepared	22	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1440	3.70	4.33	4.45	4.40	****
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n the subject	20	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1097/1448	4.13	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.57
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial present	ed and e	xplained clearly	22	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1436	3.81	4.31	4.29	4.24	****
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute	to what	you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1432	3.53	4.21	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
		Discu	ssion															
				what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourage	d to participate	22	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succ	essful		22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contril	bute to	what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	***	****	4.63	4.53	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27						Red	 quir	ed fo	 or M.	 aior	 s 1	 7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55						2.00	\)			or adda c	-	-		-	ŭ
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	-major	27
84-150												-	3				5	
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
P 19												respons				_	,	
I 0					Otl	her					5		~			-		
				? 1														

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101

SPORTS OFFICIATING

Title

Instructor: PHILYAW, KEVIN

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1134 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1522	4.78	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	604/1381	4.25	3.91	4.08	3.93	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	973/1517	4.63	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.53	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.95	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854				3.87	
• · · · · · · · • • • · · · · · · · · ·														
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
1		_	-	-	-	-	_		, 31					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
	-	-	-	-	-	-			,					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	7			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Λ						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHED 125 0101

VOLLEYBALL

25

PRIETO, JERRY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Page 1135 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr							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 voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	537/1522	4 52	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.56
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	334/1522		4.34	4.26	4.18	4.69
		estions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285		4.51		4.22	5.00
		ations reflect			0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	,		4.41	4.22	4.09	4.80
				what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1		****/1412		4.17	4.06	4.01	****
	_	_		o what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1		****/1381		3.91	4.08	3.93	****
		system clearl		-	0	6	0	0	1	0	9		160/1500		4.66	4.18		4.80
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	7	9		1028/1517		4.29	4.65	4.62	4.56
	_			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	6		695/1497					4.21
1 Wesse +1	ha Janub	Lectur	_		10	0	0	0	2	1	1	2 75	1204/1440	2 00	4 22	4 45	4 40	2 75
		ctor's lecture tor seem inter			12 12	0	0	0	2 1	1 2	1		1304/1440		4.33	4.45 4.71	4.40 4.63	3.75 4.00
				_		-	0	0	2	0	2		1353/1448		4.53			4.00
		eriai presente s contribute t		explained clearly	12 12	0	0	0	2	0	2		1056/1436 1036/1432		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00
4. DIG LIN	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you rearned	12	U	U	U	۷	U	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.25	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were al	d to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	Labora led with adequa	_	ground information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	***	****	4.35	4.33	***
_	-	_																
		Field																
				hat you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.41		****
_	_	_		uation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for con	sultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
		Self	Paced															
2. Did stu	udy quest	ions make clea	r the e	expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	***	****	4.41	4.19	****
						Dist	trib	ut i or	,									
				riequ	епсу	DIS	CIID	uc101	1									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	6	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	-1 0.1.1	- A - L	1.10	J U = 1	~	~	Gradat	_	•	1100	-	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		001		_				-	011001 9	1		2.011		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means +	here a	re not	t enoug	h
	Ü	3.33 1.30	-	P 12								_	respons				_	
				I O		Ot.1	her					4	I COPOID		91			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Course-Section: PHED 125 0201

VOLLEYBALL

30

DEY, BRIANNE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

11

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

5

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

13

Questionnaires: 19

f Maryland Page 1136
County JUN 26, 2007
2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

													_				
2				NTD	377		equer		S	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Qι	estions 			NR	NA	1	2	3	4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain new insigh	ts,skills	from this cours	e	0	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	643/1522	4.52	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.47
2. Did the instructor make	clear th	e expected goals		0	0	0	2	1	1	15	4.53	522/1522	4.61	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions	reflect t	he expected goal	S	0	2	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	509/1285	4.76	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.53
4. Did other evaluations	eflect th	e expected goals		0	14	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings of	ontribute	to what you lea	rned	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	***
6. Did written assignments	contribu	ite to what you l	earned	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	***
7. Was the grading system	clearly e	explained		0	2	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	119/1500	4.84	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.88
8. How many times was class	s cancell	.ed		1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1177/1517	4.48	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.39
9. How would you grade the	overall	teaching effecti	veness	1	2	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	385/1497	4.36	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.50
	Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	1	0	4	4.17	1112/1440	3.96	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.42	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material pr		-		13 14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contri		-	- CL = 1	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432		4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual technic		-	nding	13	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1221		4.28	3.93	3.86	****
	Discussio	:==					_	_		_							
1. Did class discussions				15	0	1	2	0	0	1		****/1280		3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students activ				16	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor enco	_	-	ssion	17	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1269		4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques	successf	ul		16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
	Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	atior	1											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	son	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
	credits Earned cum. GPA Expected Grades												 				
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-			0													_	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 4 C 0				Ger	neral	-				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	19	

Electives

Other

0

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 133 0301 University of Maryland Title WALKING/JOGGING Baltimore County Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE

Spring 2007

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 39

Page 1137 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	quer	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	8	7	15	3.63	1351/1522	3.08	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.63
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	3	26	4.32	811/1522	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.32
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	26	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.55
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	24	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	613/1476	4.42	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.42
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	26	1	1	0	1	6		****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	***
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	4	5	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	232/1500	4.73	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.73
8.	How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	600/1517	3.98	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.86
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	0	3	12	10	4.04	878/1497	3.69	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.04
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.86
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	179/1436	4.85	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.85
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0		4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.21		4.23	4.83
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	1	0	1	0			****/1221	****		3.93	3.86	****
٠.	bia additibual committee cimanoc four anaciboanaing		3	_	Ü	_	Ü			, 1221		1120	3.75	3.00	
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	6		****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	0	0	6		****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	0	6		****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4.	Were special techniques successful	33	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
_	Seminar									= 0					
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
	0.15														
-	Self Paced	2.0	0	•	•	•	-	0	4 00		also also also al	de de de d	4 65	4 50	als als als al
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Course-Section: PHED 133 0301
Title WALKING/JOGGING
Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE
Enrollment: 58

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1137 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	edits Earned Cum. GF		A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	25			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Page 1138
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

Course-Section: PHED 133 0401

45

WALKING/JOGGING

BERGERON, RYAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

2 continue							Fre	_	ncies	5			tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	7	3	5	Ο	4	2 53	1511/1522	3.08	4.01	4.30	4.14	2.53
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	3	0	5	1	10		1253/1522	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.18	3.79
		uestions reflect			0	18	0	0	0	0	1		****/1285	4.55	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	18	0	0	0	0	1		****/1476		4.41	4.22	4.09	****
				what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	0	1		****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
				what you learned	0	16	1	0	1	0	1		****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
		g system clearl			0	8	0	0	0	3			242/1500		4.66	4.18		4.73
		was class cance			0	0	1	4	7	6			1504/1517	3.98	4.29	4.65		3.11
	-			ning effectiveness	1	1	0	2	8	6			1340/1497		4.10	4.11		3.35
	2			3														
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lectures	s well 1	orepared	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1440	4.83	4.33	4.45	4.40	****
		ctor seem inter	-	-	16	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1448	4.86	4.53	4.71	4.63	****
3. Was 1	ecture mat	xplained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1436	4.85	4.31	4.29	4.24	****		
		you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1432	4.83	4.21	4.29	4.23	****		
5. Did a	udiovisua	our understanding	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****		
		-	-	5														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were	all studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	tribu	utio:	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 auire	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s 1	5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0					10	,	_	-		-	-) -		-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D 0								-			-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_f h
				P 14									respons				_	•
				I O		Otl	her					2			3			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2007

Course-Section: PHED 136 0101 Title WOMEN'S LACROSSE Instructor: CONNOR, COURTNE

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

Page 1139 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 1 1 2 4.25 330/854 4.25 4.33 4.02 3.87 4.25

			_							_	_			
			Fre	_	ncies	5			ructor	Course	-	-	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	3	3	5	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1174/1476	3.80	4.41	4.22	4.09	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1179/1381	3.44	3.91	4.08	3.93	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	7	1	3.89	1453/1517	3.89	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	957/1436	4.17	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	3.60	3.95	4.10	3.92	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.40	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.00
1 and and and and open arboardion	•	•	-	•	_	_	_		2.2/2200					

Frequency Distribution

6 1 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	6			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0101 University of Maryland Page 1140
Title TENNIS Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 22

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnai	
	aire

Questionnaires: 20

						_		T		Q	Dant	IMPG	T 1	G
Out and down	NTD	3.7.73	1 1	equei 2		S 4	5		ructor	Course	_	Mean	Level	
Questions	NK	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	211/1522	4.71	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	371/1522	4.68	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	650/1285	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1412	4.40	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	10	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	211/1500	4.76	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1284/1517	4.11	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	433/1497	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.68	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	4.84	4.53	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	558/1432	4.54	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	4.33	4.28	3.93	3.86	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1277		4.45	4.34		****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269			4.31		****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 la jor	 s 1	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1			-			_								

Credits	ts Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	9			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201 University of Maryland Page 1141 Title TENNIS JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

23

Student Course Eva	luation Questionnaire
--------------------	-----------------------

	Questions						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		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	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.71	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.75
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1522	4.68	4.34	4.26	4.18	5.00
		estions reflec			1	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
	_	ations reflect		_	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.40
				o what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	4	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	98/1500	4.76	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.92
		was class canc			0	0	0	2	6	8	0	3.38	1497/1517	4.11	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.38
				hing effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	8	3	4.00	898/1497	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	ے															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.68	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.75
		tor seem inter			11	0	0	0	0	1	4		765/1448		4.53	4.71	4.63	4.80
				3	13	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1436		4.31		4.24	****
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				12	0	0	0	0	1	3		350/1432			4.29	4.23	4.75
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				12	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/1221					****
		Discus	ai on															
1 Did ala	ace dieau			what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
				d open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
		chniques succe		a open arbeassion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 854			4.02	3.87	****
	-	-																
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	рe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s 1	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0							_			-	-	5		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	0					El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
				P 13									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her					2	_		3			
				_														

?

0

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301 University of Maryland Title TENNIS Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1142

JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

0

4

0

								-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_			Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	571/1522	4.71	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.54
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	726/1522		4.34	4.26	4.18	4.38
		estions reflect			0	8	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	938/1285				4.22	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	5	0	2	1	0	5		1009/1476		4.41	4.22	4.09	4.00
				what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1412	4.40	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
				o what you learned	. 0	10	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	3	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	387/1500	4.76	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.60
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.11	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.73
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	6	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well :	prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.68	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.57
		tor seem inter		_	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	935/1448		4.53	4.71	4.63	4.71
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	-,		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.67
		es contribute to		•	6	0	0	1	1	0		4.29	862/1432		4.21	4.29	4.23	4.29
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	6	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	408/1221	4.33	4.28	3.93	3.86	4.33
		Discus						_	_	_								
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	Τ	0		****/1280		3.95	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
		_		d open discussion	10	0 1	0	0	2	0	1		****/1269		4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	SSIUI		10	Τ	U	U	2	U	0	3.00	****/ 854	^^^	4.33	4.02	3.87	* * * * *
		Labora	- 0.307.7															
1 Did +ba	a lah ind	rease understa	-	F the material	12	0	0	0	Λ	0	1	E 00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
				ground information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228		****	4.35	4.33	****
Z. WCIC YC	ou provic	ica with aacqua	oc back	ground información	. 12	O	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 220			1.55	1.33	
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	:
										- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	3	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		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
	_		_	_		_						_			-			-

Electives

Other

1

3

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101 University of Maryland Page 1143
Title COED CREW Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: FOARD, RENEE M. Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11

C+1	~	The second second second	0	
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire

Questionnaires: 11

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	365/1522	4.73	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.73
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	128/1522		4.34	4.26	4.18	4.91
		uestions reflec			1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	***	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.41	4.22	4.09	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	4.17	4.06	4.01	3.71
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.33
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.83
			5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448		4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.83
	. Was recture material presented and explained clears . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				5	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	4.00
				d to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	_	4.00				4.34	4.13	4.00
				d open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	2		1074/1269		4.26	4.31	4.04	3.67
		echniques succe			8	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 854		4.33	4.02	3.87	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
				_	2													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					3	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	11		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1	Electives					1	#### - 1				_	ιh		
				P 7							respons	ponses to be significant						
				I 0	Other						1							

? 0

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201 University of Maryland Page 1144 JUN 26, 2007 BOWLING Baltimore County Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 KOLESKI, TARA Instructor: Enrollment: 31

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	4

Title

Questionnaires: 19

				equer	ncies	5		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	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1394/1522	3.53	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	4	2	8	3.47	1376/1522	3.47	4.34	4.26	4.18	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	154/1500	4.82	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1094/1440	4.20	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1327/1448	4.17	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1197/1436	3.80	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	15			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101 Un Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR) Instructor: CARINGI, PETE

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

15

University of Maryland Page 1145
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	1.0	4.47	656/1522	4.09	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	12	4.60	432/1522	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0		4.67	366/1285		4.51	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	378/1476		4.41	4.22	4.09	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	242/1500	4.86	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	932/1517	4.50	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	189/1497	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1280		3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	***
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	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	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	9			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	_		
				2	^						

Course-Section: PHED 144 0201 Unititle SOCCER (OUTDOOR)
Instructor: ADAMS, ANTHONY

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1146 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	Dept UMBC Leve		Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	4	0	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1315/1522	4.09	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.71
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the e	expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	545/1522	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the	expected goals	4	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluat	cions reflect the e	expected goals	6	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1476	4.60	4.41	4.22	4.09	****
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expl	ained	7	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1500	4.86	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		6	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1217/1517	4.50	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.33
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1020/1497	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.92
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	tor's lectures well	prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1440	4.86	4.33	4.45	4.40	****
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested	in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1448	4.89	4.53	4.71	4.63	***
3. Was lecture mater	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl			0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	***
4. Did the lectures	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1432	4.75	4.21	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did audiovisual t	 Did the rectures contribute to what you rearned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	***
2. Were all students	actively encourag	ged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field experie	ence contribute to	what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly u	understand your eva	luation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	***
3. Was the instructo	or available for co	nsultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree co	ould you discuss yo	our evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences h	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	10	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	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	10			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHED 146 0101 University of Maryland Title

WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT Baltimore County CANTOR, FRED Spring 2007

Instructor: Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1147

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			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	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.91	4.08	3.93	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	275/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	493/1497	4.42	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	1300/1448	4.25	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful		2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	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	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	7			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101 University of Maryland WATERPOLO Baltimore County

Page 1148 JUN 26, 2007 Title Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 CRADOCK, CHAD G Instructor: Enrollment: 24

Ouestionnaires:	14	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnaries.	± ±	Deductie c	JUULDE	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

		Fre	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	4	2	8	4.29	869/1522	4.29	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	726/1522	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1289/1517	4.21	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1304/1440	3.75	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1402/1448	3.75	4.53	4.71	4.63	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1432	****	4.21	4.29	4.23	****

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

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI Baltimore County

Title Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC Spring 2007

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 8

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1149 JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

~				~										
			Fre	eque	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	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1464/1522	3.25	4.01	4.30	4.34	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.34	4.26	4.29	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	1123/1285	3.67	4.51	4.30	4.36	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.41	4.22	4.20	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1315/1412	3.13	4.17	4.06	4.00	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1253/1500	3.63	4.66	4.18	4.20	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1343/1517	4.13	4.29	4.65	4.63	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	904/1440	4.43	4.33	4.45	4.42	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1097/1448	4.57	4.53	4.71	4.78	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	983/1221	3.33	4.28	3.93	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280	4.60	3.95	4.10	4.08	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.45	4.34	4.33	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.60

Frequency Distribution

0

0 1 3 1 4.00 426/ 854 4.00 4.33 4.02 4.00 4.00

3 0

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