Title JOGGING

Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1249 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Oberval 1 Did you gain new insider. 1 Did you gain new insider. 2 Did the instructor makes are the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 3 2 18 4.65 3.57 1479/1649 3.51 3.62 4.98 4.11 3.57 2. Did the instructor makes are the expected goals 1 20 0 0 0 3 2 18 4.65 375/1648 4.43 4.49 4.27 4.10 4.85 3.04 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/1375 4.14 4.08 4.27 4.10 4.85 4.40 4.17 4.10 4.85 4.40 4.17 4.10 4.85 4.40 4.17 4.10 4.85 5.04 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 0.00 ***/1533 4.40 3.64 4.04 3.87 *** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 7 7 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 85/1623 4.74 4.31 4.16 4.08 4.94 8.16 4.80 4.94 8.16 4.80 4.94 8.16 4.80 4.94 8.16 4.80 4.94 8.16 4.80 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.94 8.16 4.90 4.90 4.90 4.90 4.90 4.90 4.90 4.90				Questions	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. 0 2 2 4 8 5 3.57 14791649 3.51 3.62 4.28 4.11 2.57 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **********************************				Genera	 1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1. Di	d you	gain nev			m this course	3	0	2	2	4	8	5	3.57	1479/1649	3.51	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 22 0 0 0 0 1 15 0 0 0 0 11 15 0 0 0 3.97 4.20 4.03 3.77 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 7 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 85/1623 4.74 4.31 4.16 4.08 4.94 8.76 **** 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 7 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 8.86 *** 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 1 11 5 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 *** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 791/1568 4.42 4.00 4.43 4.39 4.56 2.04 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16							1	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	375/1648	4.43	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 .00 ****/1533 4.40 3.64 4.04 3.87 **** *******************************	3. Di	d the	exam que	estions reflect	t the e	expected goals	1	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	4.14	4.08	4.27	4.10	****
7. Mas the grading system clearly explained 1 7 7 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 85/1623 4.74 4.31 4.16 4.08 4.94 80 many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 1 1 6 14 4.50 113/1646 4.38 4.35 4.69 4.67 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 1 1 6 14 4.50 113/1646 4.38 4.35 4.69 4.67 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 1 1 5 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 1.00	4. Di	d oth	er evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1595	4.00	3.97	4.20	4.03	****
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 1 1 6 14 4.50 1193/1646 4.38 4.35 4.69 4.67 4.50 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 1.06 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 1.06 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 1.06 1.06 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 0 6 4.56 791/1568 4.42 4.00 4.43 4.39 4.56 1.06 1.06 1.06 1.06 1.06 1.06 1.06 1.0	5. Di	d ass	igned rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	4.40	3.64	4.04	3.87	***
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 1 11 5 4.06 886/1621 3.69 3.80 4.06 3.96 4.06 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 15 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 791/1568 4.42 4.00 4.43 4.39 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 1241/1572 4.36 4.32 4.70 4.64 4.50 3.83 bid the lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 241/1564 6.5 4.15 4.28 4.20 4.28 4.20 4.33 4.36 bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 4 4.13 1060/1559 4.19 3.91 4.29 4.20 4.13 5. Did class discousions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/1352 4.40 4.13 3.98 3.86 **** Discoussion Discoussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1352 4.40 4.13 3.98 3.86 **** Laboratory Laboratory Laboratory Laboratory Nere necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** Were pour provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1368 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** Pield Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Prequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Predits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 Majo	7. Wa	s the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	7	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1623	4.74	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.94
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Ware the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Bo 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 791/1568 4.42 4.00 4.43 4.39 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Bo 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 234/1564 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 2. Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 2. Did you clearly understand your available for Grades 2. Reasons 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. State of the paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. State of the paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. State of the paced system contribute to what you learned 4. State of the paced system contribute to what	8. Ho	w man	y times v	was class cance	elled		1	1	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	1193/1646	4.38	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Mass lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Mass lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 80 0 0 0 1 1 5 4 83 234/1564 4.54 4.15 4.28 4.20 4.83 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Were all students actively encouraged fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Zeboratory 1. Were pour provided with adequate background information 13. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19. Did the instructor en	9. Ho	w wou	ld you gi	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	1	0	1	11	5	4.06	886/1621	3.69	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 1241/1572 4.36 4.32 4.70 4.64 4.50 3. Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 234/1564 4.54 4.15 4.28 4.20 4.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 3 1 4 4.13 1060/1559 4.19 3.91 4.29 4.20 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1352 4.40 4.13 3.98 3.86 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				Lecture	е															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 234/1564 4.54 4.15 4.28 4.20 4.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 3 1 4 4.13 1060/1559 4.19 3.91 4.29 4.20 4.13 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1352 4.40 4.13 3.98 3.86 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** 2. Mere you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1386 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.*** *** 4.40 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.*** *** 4.40 4.37 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 41 **** 4.40 4.37 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. We	re th	e instru	ctor's lecture:	s well	prepared	15	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	791/1568	4.42	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1352 4.40 4.13 3.98 3.86 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.02 4.03 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Pield Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/52 **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/52 **** 4.09 3.65 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/53 **** 4.47 4.36 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.47 4.36 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.47 4.36 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.47 4.36 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Di	d the	instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	14	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1241/1572	4.36	4.32	4.70	4.64	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1352 4.40 4.13 3.98 3.86 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1388 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/128 **** 4.12 4.08 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/243 **** **** 4.12 4.08 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 53 **** 4.30 4.17 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 53 **** 4.30 4.17 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 53 **** 4.30 4.17 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 53 **** 4.30 4.17 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 48 **** 4.09 3.65 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 48 **** 4.09 4.27 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Wa	s lec	ture mate	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.54	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.83
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/12 **** 4.12 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.12 4.08 **** 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 3.72 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.30 4.17 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Major 0	4. Di	d the	lectures	s contribute to	o what	you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1060/1559	4.19	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.13
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.08 3.86 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1382 **** 4.02 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** 4.24 4.30 4.01 *** 4.24 4.30 4	5. Di	d aud	iovisual	techniques enl	hance y	our understanding	18	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	4.40	4.13	3.98	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1362 **** 4.09 4.29 4.03 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1368 **** 4.22 4.30 4.01 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/243 **** **** 4.12 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/212 **** **** 4.40 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				Discus	sion															
Laboratory Lab	1. Di	d cla	ss discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 243 **** **** 4.12 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.40 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 80-200 ***/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Frequency Distribution	2. We	re al	l student	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 243 **** **** 4.12 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.40 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.30 4.17 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors OO-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 0 B 0 Selectives Type Majors OO-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 0 General Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 General Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 General Type Required for Majors 14 H### - Means there are not enough P 11 F 0 Other Type Type Type Tesponses to be significant	3. Di	d the	instruct	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.40 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 555 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 0 Fequired for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 2.95-5 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 11				Labora	tory															
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.67 3.67 4.29 4.14 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 C28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 C	2. We	re yo	u provide	ed with adequat	te back	ground information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.30 4.17 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 8.65-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Frequency Distribution	3. We	re ne	cessary m	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced	5. We	re re	quirement	ts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	3.67	3.67	4.29	4.14	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.30 4.17 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 8.6-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				Field W	Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 **** Self Paced	1. Di	d fie	ld exper:	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	***
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.30 4.17 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 4	2. Di	d you	clearly	understand you	ur eval	uation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.30 4.17 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	3. Wa	s the	instruct	tor available :	for con	sultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 22 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 4.27 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 I 0 Other 4				Self	Paced															
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 I 0 Other 4													-		,		****			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	3. We	re yo	ur contac	cts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
00-27						Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
00-27	Credi	ts Ea:	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Τv	pe			Majors	}
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4						·														
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 24 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 responses to be significant			-		-	== =		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	4	Graduat	е	U	Majo	or	0
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 I 0 Other 4			-		-	= *		~ -		1				1	TT7		. 1	3 7		0.4
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 I 0 Other 4								Ger	ıera.	T				Т	unaer-g	rau 2	4	Non-	-wa Jor	∠4
P 11 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4			-			= *		רה.	-a+	a				1	####	Moana +	horo s	vo not	onoma	rh
I 0 Other 4	Grad	١.	U	3.50-4.00	٥	- · ·		т⊥€	=CLT,	ves				Τ.					_	111
						= ==		∩+1	ner.					4	respons	LD LU L	o argi	ııı ıCal.	10	
								561						-						

Course-Section: PHED 109 0201 University of Maryland JOGGING

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Instructor: BLANCHARD, IAN Fall 2008

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 20

Page 1250

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	. L															
1. Did yo	ou gain new	v insights,skil	ls from	this course	0	0	3	1	5	6	5	3.45	1511/1649	3.51	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.45
2. Did th	ne instruct	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	966/1648	4.43	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.20
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflect	: the ex	spected goals	0	13	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.14
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	14	0	1	1	1	3		1067/1595	4.00	3.97	4.20	4.03	4.00
			_	hat you learned	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	3.64	4.04	3.87	4.40
6. Did wr	ritten assi	lgnments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	14	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.67	4.10	3.86	4.00
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	z explai	ned	0	5	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	469/1623	4.74	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.53
		vas class cance	_		0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	1398/1646	4.38	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.25
	_			ning effectiveness	4	1	0	2	8	3			1429/1621		3.80	4.06	3.96	3.33
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	the instruc	ctor's lectures	well r	prepared	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1096/1568	4.42	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did th	ne instruct	or seem intere	ested in	the subject	11	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1409/1572	4.36	4.32	4.70	4.64	4.22
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presented	l and ex	plained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1564	4.54	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.25
4. Did th	ne lectures	s contribute to	what y	ou learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	966/1559	4.19	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques enh	lance yo	our understanding	12	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.40
		Discuss							_		_							
				hat you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1384		3.98	4.08		****
				l to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1382		4.09	4.29		****
				l open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368	****	4.22	4.30		****
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succes	sful		17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****
E Mono m		Laborat	_	orly aposified	13	1	2	0	0	0	1	2 67	/E0 / EEE	2 67	2 67	4 20	1 11	3.67
5. were r	requirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	13	1	2	U	U	U	4	3.67	458/ 555	3.07	3.07	4.29	4.14	3.07
5. Were o	riteria fo	Seminar or grading made			12	2	1	0	0	5	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.50	3.68	3.54	3.50
1 511 61		Field W			1.0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	F 00	**** LO	****	****	1 00	2 70	****
				nat you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52 ****/ 48	****	~~~~	4.06		****
		understand you or available f		ation criteria	19 18	0 1	0	0	0 0	0	1		****/ 48 ****/ 39	****	****	4.09 4.47		****
							0	0	0	0			****/ 39	****	****		4.36	****
	_	could you discu	_		18 14	1 2	0	0	0	3	1		****/ 312	****	****	4.38		****
5. DIG CC	niterences	neip you carry	Out II	eld activities	14	۷	U	U	U	3	1	4.25	/ 312			3.00	3.31	
5. Were t	here enoug	Self F ah proctors for		ne students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
J. Well c	silere ellous	in proceeds for	all ci							-	Ü	1.00	, 110			3.33	3.03	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	0 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 3	В 0 С 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	:0	Non-	-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				_				_	_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0 P 7		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - respons				_	ın
				I 0 ? 1		Oth	ner					1	-		3			

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: BERGER, KELLY

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 23

Page 1251 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA		equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	5	1	9	2	6		1587/1649		3.62	4.28	4.11	3.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	1	6	4	10		1296/1648		4.09	4.23	4.16	3.83
	_	uestions reflec		_	1	16	0	0	1	0	5		401/1375		4.08	4.27	4.10	4.67
		uations reflect			1	20	0	0	1	0	1		****/1595		3.97	4.20	4.03	****
				what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	0	0		****/1533		3.64	4.04	3.87	****
		_		o what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1512		3.67	4.10	3.86	****
		g system clearl		ined	1	11	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623		4.31	4.16	4.08	4.45
		was class canc			1	1	0	4	7	7	3		1637/1646		4.35	4.69	4.67	3.43
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	2	1	9	4	3	3.26	1449/1621	3.34	3.80	4.06	3.96	3.26
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1096/1568	4.29	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the	instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	16	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1521/1572	3.71	4.32	4.70	4.64	3.71
3. Was led	ture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	16	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.00
5. Did aud	liovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	15	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	***	4.13	3.98	3.86	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss disc			what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1309/1384	2.83	3.98	4.08	3.86	2.83
				d to participate	17	0	1	0	1	2	2		1146/1382		4.09	4.29	4.03	3.67
		_	_	d open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	2	2		1129/1368		4.22	4.30	4.01	3.67
		echniques succe		a open arroadren	17	4	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 948		3.86	3.95	3.75	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria :	for grading mad	_		22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did con	ference			ield activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	-rib	ıt i oı	า									
				11040	.01107	210												
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	8	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 12									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					4	_		_			
				s 0														

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201 University of Maryland Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: KOENIG, ERIN

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1252

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	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	2	4	7	4	2	3.00	1603/1649	3.07	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	10	2	5	3.47	1494/1648	3.65	4.09	4.23	4.16	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1242/1595	3.83	3.97	4.20	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1412/1512	3.13	3.67	4.10	3.86	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	.,	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	13	4		1506/1646	3.77	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	7	7	1	3.41	1399/1621	3.34	3.80	4.06	3.96	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	4.29	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1572	3.71	4.32	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1564	4.00	4.15	4.28	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1559	4.00	3.91	4.29	4.20	****
Diamondo														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/1384	2.83	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Τ0	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/1304	2.03	3.90	4.00	3.00	
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53		****	4.30	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	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	19	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	11			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301 University of Maryland Page 1253
Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: HEARIN, MARY C Fall 2008
Enrollment: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 16

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

9

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

12

Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills fro	m this course	0	0	0	3	4	3	6	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	743/1648	4.38	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the	expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.08	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the ex	pected goals	0	11	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	3.97	4.20	4.03	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to	what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1533	***	3.64	4.04	3.87	****
6. Did written assignments contribute t	o what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.25	3.67	4.10	3.86	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly expla	ined	0	5	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1623	4.91	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1059/1646	4.64	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	4.14	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.14
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well	prepared	12	0	0	0	0	Λ	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.00	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in		11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572		4.32	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and e	-	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	651/1564		4.15	4.28	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what		11	0	2	0	1	0	2		1479/1559	3.00	3.91	4.29	4.20	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance	-	11	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/1352				3.86	****
5. Dia dadiovidual deciminques cimianee j	our unacroduraring			Ü	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	_	3.00	, 1331		1115	3.70	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encourage	d to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	***	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair ar	d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	***	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful		14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****
	Enom		7 Dist	- m i bı	.+ :	_									
	Frequ	iency	DIS	LIDU	1110	[1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Rec	 quire	ed f	or M	 aior	s 1	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0	В 0)		-	01 00000	-	-		_	ŭ
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	major	16
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 3	D 0									5		-		5	-
2 2 2 2 3 3 3 1 3	2 0														

Electives

Other

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

45

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101 University of Maryland Page 1254 FEB 11, 2009 WALKING/JOGGING Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2 02	1335/1649	3.72	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	11	4.35			4.09	4.23	4.16	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	0	0		****/1375		4.08	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	2	0	0		****/1595		3.97	4.20	4.03	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	1	0		****/1533		3.64	4.04	3.87	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	_	14	0	1	2	0	0		****/1512		3.67	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	, -		4.31	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	,		4.35	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		2	0	0	1	7	1	4.00			3.80	4.06		4.00
y. non would you grade one everall codoning errocertaness	Ü	_	ŭ	ŭ	-	•	_	1.00	711,1021	1.05	3.00	1.00	3.70	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	4.17	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572		4.32	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1564		4.15	4.28	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/1559		3.91	4.29	4.20	****
The same resoluted constructed to make for rearrest		ŭ	Ü	Ū	_	Ū	_	5.07	, 2005		3.71	1.27	1.20	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382		4.09	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1368		4.22	4.30	4.01	****
5. Did the instructor encourage rail and open discussion	10	O	U	O	U	_	O	1.00	71300		1.22	1.50	1.01	
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	2	5 00	****/ 555	****	3 67	4.29	4 14	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports orearry specifica	13	Ü	Ü	O	Ü	o	_	3.00	, 333		3.07	1.27		
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 288	****	3 50	3.68	3 54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 200		3.30	3.00	3.31	
Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	ition	n									
													_	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor		9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			-			-								
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Ger	neral	_				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														

Other

responses to be significant

2

Ρ

I

8

0

0

Course-Section: PHED 133 0201
Title WALKING/JOGGING
Instructor: FAHEY, KELLY A.

43

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1255 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General			•		_	_							4 00		
	w insights, skills fr		0	0	3	1	7	4	9		1457/1649			4.28	4.11	3.63
	tor make clear the e		1 0	0 19	1	0	5 1	3 1	14 3	4.26	885/1648 ****/1375		4.09	4.23	4.16 4.10	4.26 ****
_	lestions reflect the Lations reflect the e	_	0	19	0	1	0	1	3		****/1595		3.97	4.27	4.10	****
	adings contribute to	_	1	19	0	0	0	1	3		****/1533		3.64	4.04	3.87	****
_	signments contribute	-	1	20	0	0	0	1	2		****/1512		3.67	4.10	3.86	****
	signments contribute system clearly expl	-	0	6	0	2	1	1	14	4.50	, -		4.31	4.16		4.50
	was class cancelled	ainea	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	913/1646		4.35	4.69		4.75
-	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	859/1621		3.80		3.96	4.10
	Lecture															
1. Were the instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	18	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.17
	tor seem interested		19	0	1	0	0	1			****/1572		4.32	4.70	4.64	****
	erial presented and		18	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.50
	es contribute to what		18	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.17
	techniques enhance	-	18	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	***	4.13	3.98	3.86	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discu	ssions contribute to	what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all studen	its actively encourag	ed to participate	20	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instruc	tor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special te	chniques successful		21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provid	led with adequate bac	kground information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	***	****	4.12	4.08	****
	Seminar			_				_								
5. Were criteria f	for grading made clea	r	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.50	3.68	3.54	****
	Field Work				_											
-	rience contribute to	-	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52		****	4.06	3.72	****
	understand your eva		23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48		****	4.09	3.65	***
5. Did conferences	s help you carry out	field activities	21	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
1 Did golf maged	Self Paced	what was loowned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
i. Did sell-paced	system contribute to	what you rearned	43	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 53			4.30	4.1/	
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s 1	. 6	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 0 56-83 0	1.00-1.99 0 $2.00-2.99$ 4	B 0 C 0		Co	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad ⁿ	24	Non	-major	24
84-150 16	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Ge.	nera.	1				т	onder-g	ıau 2	. 4	NOI1-	-iiia JOF	24
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 P 19		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - respons					rh
		I 0		Ot!	her					5	rephone	LD LU L	o argi	ıııcal	10	
		? 1														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1256

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Ouestions

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101

COED CREW

19

FOARD, RENEE M.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Genera	_	. 1				•		_	_	4 00	0.45 /4.540			4 00		4 00
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0 2	Ţ	5 2	4.83	247/1649	4.83	3.62 4.09	4.28	4.11	4.83
		ctor make clear uestions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	2 1	_		1124/1648 546/1375	4.00	4.09	4.23	4.16 4.10	4.00 4.50
		lestions reflect lations reflect			0	4	0	0	0	1	1 1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.97	4.27	4.10	4.50
		g system clearl			0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.31	4.16	4.03	4.33
		was class canc		ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	2		1340/1646		4.35	4.69	4.67	4.33
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	0		1261/1621			4.09		3.67
9. HOW WO	outu you g	grade the overa	II tead	ning effectiveness	3	U	U	U	_	2	U	3.07	1201/1021	3.07	3.00	4.00	3.90	3.07
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1564/1568	2.00	4.00	4.43	4.39	2.00
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1365/1572	4.33	4.32	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.15	4.28	4.20	3.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	3.91	4.29	4.20	3.50
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1384		3.98	4.08	3.86	****
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	_		5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****
3	71100110 1	or grading mad	0 01001		J	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 200		3.30	3.00	3.31	
		Field																
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	****	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
				1.														
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
~ 1	0	3.50-4.00	0	F O		E16	ecti	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	U	r 0								_		ricarib c	TICIC G	1100	011045	
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	O	P 2			3001					3	respons					,

Course-Section: PHED 146 0201 University of Maryland

WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT Baltimore County CANTOR, FRED Fall 2008

? 0

Title WEIGHT TRAIN/
Instructor: CANTOR, FRED

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1257 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	1	2	5	5		1311/1649		3.62		4.11	3.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	3	6		1124/1648		4.09	4.23	4.16	4.00
				what you learned		13	0	0	1	0	0		****/1533		3.64	4.04	3.87	****
		g system clearl		ined	0	8	1	0	0	1			915/1623		4.31	4.16		4.17
		was class canc			0	0	1	0	1	5			1426/1646		4.35	4.69		4.21
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	766/1621	4.18	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.18
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1568	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
		ctor seem inter			11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1572	****	4.32	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1564	****	4.15	4.28	4.20	****
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1559	****	3.91	4.29	4.20	****
Discussion																		
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
				d to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	_		****/1382		4.09	4.29	4.03	****
				d open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0			****/1368		4.22	4.30	4.01	****
		- 1																
5. Were r	requireme	Labora nts for lab rep		early specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.14	****
	1			7									,					
		Semina	_															
5. Were c	criteria	for grading mad	e clear	•	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	10	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 0		Required for Majo						.U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		General						2	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -					jh
				P 9									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0		Other						0						

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1258 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			5		Inst	tructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	_	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
1 5'1	General		0	0	•	_	_	1.0	_	2 60	1 4 17 1 / 1	<i>-</i> 10	2 52	2 60	4 00	4 00	2 60
	new insights, skills from th		0	0	0	3	7	12	3		1471/1		3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.60
	ructor make clear the expect	-	0	0	0	1	5	9	10		1043/1		4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.12
	questions reflect the expec		0	0	1	1	8	4	11		1017/1		3.90	4.08	4.27		3.92
	aluations reflect the expect		0	0	0	1	8	8	8		1175/1		3.92	3.97	4.20		
_	readings contribute to what	-	0	0	2	1	8	10	4		1235/1		3.52	3.64	4.04		3.52
	assignments contribute to wh	-	0	0	0	5	9	6	5		1298/1			3.67	4.10		
_	ing system clearly explained	Į.	1	0	0	1		10			1009/1		4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.04
	es was class cancelled	cc	1	0	0	0	0	2			597/1		4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.92
9. How would you	u grade the overall teaching	g effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	1001/1	621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.94
	Lecture																
1. Were the inst	tructor's lectures well prep	pared	0	0	0	2	5	6	12	4.12	1220/1	568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.10
	ructor seem interested in th		0	0	0	0	1	10	14		1222/1		4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.51
	material presented and expla	-	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	780/1		4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.39
	ures contribute to what you	_	0	0	0	0	6	6	13	4.28	945/1		3.99	3.91	4.29		4.34
	ual techniques enhance your		0	0	1	0	7	7	10	4.00	690/1		4.02	4.13	3.98		3.94
5. Dia addiovido	dar scomirques cimanos your	anaci boanaing	Ü	ŭ	_	Ü	•	•		1.00	0,00,1		1.02	1113	3.70	1.07	3.71
	Discussion																
	scussions contribute to what		5	0	0	1	4	3		4.30	644/1		4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.30
	dents actively encouraged to		5	0	0	0	5	4		4.30	799/1		4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.30
	ructor encourage fair and op	en discussion	6	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	639/1	368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.53
4. Were special	techniques successful		6	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	492/	948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.95
	Laboratory																
2 Were you prov	vided with adequate backgrou	nd information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
	ments for lab reports clearl		24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/		****	3.67	4.29		****
o. More requirem	menes for tas reports ofear	. 7 Specifica		ŭ	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	2.00	,	555		3.07	1.27	1.55	
	Seminar																
 Were assigned 	d topics relevant to the ann	ounced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	1.55		88	***	****	4.54	3.75	***
	ructor available for individ		22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
	projects contribute to what	-	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
Did presentat	tions contribute to what you	ı learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria	a for grading made clear		20	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/	288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****
	Field Work																
5. Did conferenc	rield work ces help you carry out field	l activities	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****
5. Più 00111010110	ood norp you ourly out from			ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.00	,	311			3.00	3.37	
	Self Paced																
5. Were there en	nough proctors for all the s	students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****
		Frequ	encv	Dist	ribı	ıtioı	า										
		1-					_										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA E	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3				Тур	рe			Majors	3
00-27 4	0.00-0.99 1	 A 9		Rec	quire	 ed f	 วะ M:			1	 Grad	luate	 _	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		VG.	10TTC	-u _(J. 1410	10ر	2	_	Grau	اممادا	_	J	Ma J	J_	U
56-83 0		Ger	neral	l				0	Unde	r-ai	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	25		
84-150 0								-				-					
Grad. 0						ves				0	####	: - I	Means t	here a	re not	t enoug	rh
-		P 0											es to k			_	-
		I O		Other						8				. 5-			

? 0 Course-Section: PHED 202 0101 University of Maryland

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 25

	Evaluation	

Page 1259

							eque					tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights, skills i	from this course	0	0	0	3	7	12	3	3 60	1471/1649	3 53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.60
_	-	ctor make clear the		0	0	0	1	5	9	10		1043/1648		4.09	4.23	4.25	4.12
		uestions reflect the		0	0	1	1	8	4	11		1017/1375		4.08	4.27	4.37	3.92
	_	uations reflect the		0	0	0	1	8	8	8		1175/1595				4.22	
		eadings contribute t		0	0	2	1	8	10	4		1235/1533			4.04	4.04	3.52
	_	_	to what you learned	0	0	0	5	9	6	5		1298/1512		3.67	4.10	4.14	3.44
		g system clearly exp		1	0	0	1	5	10			1009/1623			4.16	4.21	
	-	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	2			597/1646			4.69		4.92
	-		eaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	9			1016/1621				4.01	
		Lecture															
1 Were +	he inctr	uctor's lectures wel	ll prepared	1	0	0	2	5	6	11	4 08	1243/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.10
		ctor seem interested		1	0	0	0	1	10	13		1243/1500		4.32	4.70	4.73	4.51
		terial presented and	_	1	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	812/1564		4.15	4.28	4.73	4.31
		es contribute to wha		2	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	841/1559		3.91	4.29	4.33	
			e your understanding	1	0	2	0	6	7	9	3.88					4.07	
5. Dia au	laiovisua	i teciniiques emiance	e your understanding		U	4	U	0	,	J	3.00	030/1332	4.02	4.13	3.90	4.07	3.34
1 5'1 1		Discussion		_	0	0	-		2	1.0	4 20	644/1204	4 15	2 00	4 00	2 00	4 20
		ussions contribute t	_	5	0	0	1	4	3	12		644/1384		3.98	4.08	3.99	4.30
		nts actively encoura		5	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	799/1382		4.09	4.29	4.19	4.30
		_	and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	639/1368		4.22	4.30	4.21	
4. Were s	special t	echniques successful	L	6	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	492/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.95
_		Laboratory															
			ackground information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243		****	4.12	4.47	****
5. Were r	requireme:	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	***	3.67	4.29	4.33	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant to t	the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available for	individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did re	esearch p	rojects contribute t	to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did pr	resentati	ons contribute to wh	nat you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made cle	ear	20	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 288	***	3.50	3.68	3.65	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry out	field activities	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****
		Self Paced	i														
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for all	l the students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.72	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Omodita E	lownod	Cum CDA	Ermont od Crodon				Do	2222	a			т.				Majara	
Credits E	ratiiea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке 	ason					pe 			Majors 	
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 9					Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	ŝ	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2					~		7				0	TT7) F	37		٥٦
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1					nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	25
84-150											0			-1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		ΕŢ	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	111
			P 0 T 0		<u>~</u> ,	lo =					0	respons	es to 1	be sign	ııııcaı	10	
			I 0		Ut	Other					8						

M: PHED 202 0102

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor: FAHEY, KELLY A. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 26

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1260 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 5 8 8 3 3.19 1574/1649 3.53 3.62 4.28 4.29 3.19 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. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. To 1 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.51 8. How rethe instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 1 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. O 1 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77 2. Was all students actively expressed to participate 4 0 1 0 7 8 8 6 3 82 1055/1382 4.17 4.09 4.29 4.19 3.22	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 5 8 8 8 3 3.19 1574/1649 3.53 3.62 4.28 4.29 3.19 2.0 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 8 8 7 3.73 1361/1648 4.04 4.09 4.23 4.25 3.73 3.01 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 0 7 9 8 3.81 1087/1375 3.90 4.08 4.27 4.37 3.81 4.01 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 4 4 13 4 3.68 1323/1595 3.92 3.97 4.20 4.22 3.68 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 3 3 9 8 2 3.12 1415/1533 3.52 3.64 4.04 4.04 3.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 13 6 5 3.46 1287/1512 3.61 3.67 4.10 4.14 3.46 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 6 5 12 3.92 1149/1623 4.03 4.31 4.16 4.21 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 16 6 4.04 1532/1646 4.36 4.35 4.69 4.63 4.04 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3.04 2.05 2.05 2.05 2.05 2.05 2.05 2.05 2.05															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 8 8 7 3.73 1361/1648 4.04 4.09 4.23 4.25 3.73 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 0 7 9 8 3.81 1087/1375 3.90 4.08 4.27 4.37 3.81 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 4 4 13 4 3.68 1323/1595 3.92 3.97 4.20 4.22 3.68 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 3 9 8 2 3.12 1415/1533 3.52 3.64 4.04 4.04 3.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 13 6 5 3.46 1287/1512 3.61 3.67 4.10 4.14 3.46 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 1 6 5 12 3.92 1149/1623 4.03 4.31 4.16 4.21 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 16 6 4.04 1532/1646 4.36 4.35 4.69 4.63 4.04 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02		0	٥	2	_	0	0	2	2 10	1574/1640	2 52	2 62	1 20	4 20	2 10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 0 7 9 8 3.81 1087/1375 3.90 4.08 4.27 4.37 3.81 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 4 4 13 4 3.68 1323/1595 3.92 3.97 4.20 4.22 3.68 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 3 9 8 2 3.12 1415/1533 3.52 3.64 4.04 4.04 3.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 13 6 5 3.46 1287/1512 3.61 3.67 4.10 4.14 3.46 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 1 6 5 12 3.92 1149/1623 4.03 4.31 4.16 4.21 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 16 6 4.04 1532/1646 4.36 4.35 4.69 4.63 4.04 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3.83 8.12 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.47 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4					-	-	-								
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 2 1 6 5 12 3.92 1149/1623 4.03 4.31 4.16 4.21 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. O 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute															
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 3 9 8 2 3.12 1415/1533 3.52 3.64 4.04 4.04 3.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 13 6 5 3.46 1287/1512 3.61 3.67 4.10 4.14 3.46 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 1 6 5 12 3.92 1149/1623 4.03 4.31 4.16 4.21 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 16 6 4.04 1532/1646 4.36 4.35 4.69 4.63 4.04 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00															
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 13 6 5 3.46 1287/1512 3.61 3.67 4.10 4.14 3.46 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 1 6 5 12 3.92 1149/1623 4.03 4.31 4.16 4.21 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 16 6 4.04 1532/1646 4.36 4.35 4.69 4.63 4.04 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77								2							
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 16 6 4.04 1532/1646 4.36 4.35 4.69 4.63 4.04 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	-		0	2	0	13	6	5						4.14	3.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 3 7 4 4 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.80 4.06 4.01 3.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	5	12	3.92	1149/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	3.92
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Dia audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 Discussion 7 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 Dia audiovisual techniques enhance your learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned your learned y	8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	16	6	4.04	1532/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.04
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 8 7 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.96 4.00 4.43 4.39 3.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	3	7	4	4	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 1439/1572 4.17 4.32 4.70 4.73 3.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 5 10 7 3.88 1235/1564 4.12 4.15 4.28 4.27 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	8	7	7	3.75	1401/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 6 7 7 3.74 1289/1559 3.99 3.91 4.29 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77		3	0	1	0	2	12	8	4.13	1439/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 6 8 10 4.17 582/1352 4.02 4.13 3.98 4.07 4.02 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77							10	7	3.88	1235/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.63
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	-					-	7								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 8 8 5 3.77 953/1384 4.17 3.98 4.08 3.99 3.77	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	6	8	10	4.17	582/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.02
	Discussion														
2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 7 8 6 3 82 1065/1382 4 17 4 00 4 20 4 10 3 82		4	-		_	-	8	5	3.77	953/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	3.77
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	8	6		1065/1382		4.09	4.29	4.19	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 6 9 7 4.05 936/1368 4.32 4.22 4.30 4.21 4.05								-							
4. Were special techniques successful 4 1 2 1 6 8 4 3.52 694/948 3.86 3.86 3.95 3.89 3.52	4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	694/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.52
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 3.67 4.29 4.33 ****	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	***
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.35 5.00 ****					-	-	-	_		, -	****	****			
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 23 0 1 0 0 2 0 3.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.50 3.68 3.65 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	***
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 2 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.93 ****					-			-		, -	****				
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.05 ****								-		, -					
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 23 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.49 ****								•		,					
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 23 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 **** 39 **** **** 4.38 3.66 ****								•		,					
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 1 1 1 0 1 0 2.33 ****/ 312 **** **** 3.68 3.59 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced							_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.30 4.07 ****								0		, 55	****	****			
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 25 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 30 **** **** 4.16 1.50 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 25 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 24 **** **** 4.42 2.00 ****							-	-		,	****				
1. Was the recastack/editing by proceeds herpful 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 5.00 / 21 1.12 2.00							-	-							
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 110 **** **** 3.99 3.72 ****	o. were there enough proctors for all the students	∠5	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	~~^/ 110	^^^	^^^*	3.99	3.72	* * * * *

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A 19	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F C	0	Electives	0			are not enough	ı
				P (0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

I 0 Other 15

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1261 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NTD	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie:	S 1	_		tructor	Course	-			
Questions	NK	NA				-4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	5	8	8	3	3 19	1574/1649	3 53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	8	7		1361/1648		4.09	4.23	4.25	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	9	8		1087/1375				4.37	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	13	-		1323/1595		3.97		4.22	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	9	8			1415/1533				4.04	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	13	6			1287/1512		3.67		4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	5			1149/1623		4.31		4.21	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	16			1532/1646			4.69	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	4	1			1225/1621				4.01	
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	_	3.71	1223/1021	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.01	3.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1484/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1549/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1433/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1460/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	836/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.02
Discussion		0	0	-	0	_	_	2 55	052/1204	4 1 1	2 00	4 00	2 00	2 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	8	8	5	3.77	953/1384		3.98	4.08	3.99	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	8	6		1065/1382		4.09	4.29	4.19	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	936/1368		4.22		4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	694/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.52
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar	٥٦	0	0	^	0	^	1	F 00	****/ 00	****		4 25	F 00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0 1	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	2 -0	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	U	Т	U	U	2	U	3.00	****/ 288	***	3.50	3.68	3.65	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	***	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	***	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced	0.5	0	0	0	•	-	0	4 00		and and	ate ate ate at	4 20	4 05	ale ale ale al
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	***	***	4.16	1.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.72	****
Frequ	Frequency Distribution													

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

I 0 Other 15

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI Instructor:

Enrollment: 30

Baltimore County DRISCOLL, CHRIS (Instr. A)

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1262 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires: 26	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	
-------------------	---	--

	Frequencies I		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Ouestions	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	0	6	11	7	3.81	1351/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	885/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	992/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	930/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	10	8	3.92	905/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	10		3.92	994/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	6		4.12	968/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22			1491/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	15		3.95	987/1621		3.80	4.06	4.01	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	_	U	O	-	13	,	3.73	J07/1021	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.01	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	1112/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	8	12		1419/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	844/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	14	4.31	931/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	6	6	11	4.13	616/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.09
J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	U	2	U	_	U	O		7.13	010/1332	1.02	1.13	3.90	1.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	520/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	732/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	764/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	411/ 948	3.86	3.86			4.10
1. Were special reciminates successful	3	U	O	O	5		,	1.10	111/ 510	3.00	3.00	3.75	3.05	1.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	21	U	U	4	U	U	U	2.00	/ 555		3.07	7.27	1.55	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	4	0		****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	U	_	O	O	-	U	3.10	, 200		3.30	3.00	3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	3	1	0		****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****
J. Dia conferences help you carry out fred activities	20	_	_	J	J	_	U	2.00	/ 312			5.00	٠. ١٠	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	***
J. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	4	U	J	U	J	1	Τ.	Ŧ.5U	/ 110			3.22	3.14	

Course-Section: PHED 202 0103 Title

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

DRISCOLL, CHRIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 26

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1262 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	xpected Grades Reasons			Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	 А	14	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	0						

202 0103 University of Maryland
TO HEALTH BEHAVI Baltimore County

Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Fall 2008

Page 1263 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	30		
Questionnaires:	26	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	5

				Frequencies			Instructor		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	0	0	2	0	6	11	7	3.81	1351/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.81
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	885/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.27
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	992/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.96
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	930/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	4.16
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	10	8	3.92	905/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.92
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	10	8	3.92	994/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.92
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	6	12	4.12	968/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.12
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1491/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.12
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	2	13	0	3.75	1192/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.85
	Lecture														
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	9	6		1191/1568	3.96		4.43	4.39	4.22
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	1333/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.29
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	8		4.33	854/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.34
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	5	4	8		1098/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	4.18
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	661/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.09
	Discussion	_				_	_		4 40				4 00		4 40
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	520/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.43
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	5		4.38	732/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.38
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	764/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.38
4.	Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	411/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	4.10
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	1 1E	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.45	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.12	4.47 4.62	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.33	4.33	****
٦.	were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	21	U	U	2	U	U	U	2.00	/ 555		3.07	4.20	1.33	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****
	g g														
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	1.0	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****

INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI

Title Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1263 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	 А	14	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to be significant		gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	0						