

Course-Section: PHED 109 2
 Title Jogging
 Instructor: Mumma, Robert S
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1144
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	4	8	3	7	3.11	1469/1509	3.11	3.86	4.31	4.18	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	17	4.41	699/1509	4.41	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1459	****	4.32	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	25	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.22	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	92/1489	4.91	4.61	4.17	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1199/1506	4.35	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	4	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	762/1463	4.13	4.28	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.49	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	863/1421	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	1	1	0	10	4.31	841/1411	4.31	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	2	0	1	7	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.34	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.68	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1260	****	4.51	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1258	****	4.50	4.38	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	14						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 1
 Title Physical Fitness
 Instructor: D'Archangelo, Mi
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1145
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	3	9	3	13	3.41	1422/1509	3.63	3.86	4.31	4.18	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	12	4	16	3.94	1132/1509	4.20	4.45	4.26	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	240/1287	4.78	4.74	4.30	4.24	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	27	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1459	****	4.32	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	****/1406	****	4.22	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	10	0	0	5	0	15	4.50	458/1489	4.70	4.61	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	1	29	4.84	702/1506	4.80	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	6	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	556/1463	4.28	4.28	4.09	4.02	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	3	0	1	0	11	4.07	1185/1438	4.19	4.49	4.46	4.44	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	2	1	0	10	4.14	1322/1421	4.40	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	1	1	0	10	4.07	1015/1411	4.29	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	3	1	1	0	0	10	4.42	745/1405	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.27	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	8	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1236	****	4.68	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/1260	****	4.51	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1258	****	4.50	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.39	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 19	Under-grad 34	Non-major 34
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 19			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 121 2
 Title Physical Fitness
 Instructor: Smith, Kerry
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1146
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	7	13	3.84	1258/1509	3.63	3.86	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	23	4.47	605/1509	4.20	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1287	4.78	4.74	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/1459	****	4.32	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1406	****	4.22	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	10	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	92/1489	4.70	4.61	4.17	4.20	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	845/1506	4.80	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	14	9	4.23	648/1463	4.28	4.28	4.09	4.02	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	1032/1438	4.19	4.49	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1014/1421	4.40	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	617/1411	4.29	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	881/1405	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.27	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1236	****	4.68	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/1260	****	4.51	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1258	****	4.50	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.39	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 19	Under-grad 33	Non-major 33
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 20			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 122D 1
 Title Self Def & Safety for
 Instructor: Maguire, Brian J
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1147
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	3.86	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1034/1509	4.08	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.74	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1367/1459	3.33	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1246/1406	3.38	4.22	4.09	4.02	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1282/1384	3.27	4.15	4.11	3.98	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	1197/1489	3.75	4.61	4.17	4.20	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.25	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.28	4.09	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1094/1438	4.22	4.49	4.46	4.44	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1145/1411	3.90	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1132/1405	3.90	4.34	4.32	4.27	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1236	****	4.68	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	691/1260	4.14	4.51	4.14	3.95	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.59	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.50	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.39	4.03	3.89	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 5			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHED 123 1
 Title Sports Officiating
 Instructor: Moore,Jeffrey M
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1148
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.86	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.15	4.11	3.98	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.17	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.28	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.49	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.27	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.68	4.00	3.87	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.51	4.14	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.59	4.33	4.15	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.18	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.39	4.03	3.89	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 133 1
 Title Walking/Jogging
 Instructor: Jancuska JR,Joh
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1149
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	6	5	15	3.73	1314/1509	3.74	3.86	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	5	24	4.48	574/1509	4.49	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	261/1287	4.69	4.74	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	24	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1406	4.47	4.22	4.09	4.02	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	278/1384	4.47	4.15	4.11	3.98	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	192/1489	4.78	4.61	4.17	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	762/1506	4.46	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	4	12	10	4.04	836/1463	4.09	4.28	4.09	4.02	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	970/1438	4.60	4.49	4.46	4.44	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	1049/1421	4.73	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	0	2	6	3.82	1182/1411	4.21	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.34	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1236	****	4.68	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	****/1260	****	4.51	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/1258	****	4.50	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	4.39	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 20	Under-grad 33	Non-major 33
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 23			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 133 2
 Title Walking/Jogging
 Instructor: Fahey, Kelly A
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1150
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	3	8	3.75	1304/1509	3.74	3.86	4.31	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	543/1509	4.49	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	403/1287	4.69	4.74	4.30	4.24	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	860/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	683/1406	4.47	4.22	4.09	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	531/1384	4.47	4.15	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	145/1489	4.78	4.61	4.17	4.20	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	1340/1506	4.46	4.46	4.67	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	738/1463	4.09	4.28	4.09	4.02	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.60	4.49	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.73	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	496/1411	4.21	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1405	4.40	4.34	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.68	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1260	****	4.51	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	4.50	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.39	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 9			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 202 2
 Title Intro To Health Behavi
 Instructor: Fahey,Kelly A
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1151
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	3	12	3	3.50	1399/1509	3.96	3.86	4.31	4.34	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	796/1509	4.58	4.45	4.26	4.32	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	481/1287	4.64	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	885/1459	4.38	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	0	5	4	6	3.56	1159/1406	3.99	4.22	4.09	4.09	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	756/1384	4.36	4.15	4.11	4.09	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	823/1489	4.44	4.61	4.17	4.19	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	16	1	3.77	1467/1506	4.12	4.46	4.67	4.61	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	853/1463	4.21	4.28	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	1116/1438	4.52	4.49	4.46	4.48	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	1206/1421	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.76	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	677/1411	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	1028/1405	4.38	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	322/1236	4.52	4.68	4.00	4.11	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	613/1260	4.45	4.51	4.14	4.19	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	554/1255	4.67	4.59	4.33	4.37	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	444/1258	4.74	4.50	4.38	4.44	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	344/ 873	4.40	4.39	4.03	4.04	4.23
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 2	A 14	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 0		
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 202 3
 Title Intro To Health Behavi
 Instructor: Nicholson,Laure
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1152
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	698/1509	3.96	3.86	4.31	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	167/1509	4.58	4.45	4.26	4.32	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	282/1287	4.64	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	313/1459	4.38	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	423/1406	3.99	4.22	4.09	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	251/1384	4.36	4.15	4.11	4.09	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	254/1489	4.44	4.61	4.17	4.19	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1098/1506	4.12	4.46	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	452/1463	4.21	4.28	4.09	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	305/1438	4.52	4.49	4.46	4.48	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	691/1421	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	148/1411	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	381/1405	4.38	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	223/1236	4.52	4.68	4.00	4.11	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	337/1260	4.45	4.51	4.14	4.19	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	278/1255	4.67	4.59	4.33	4.37	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	421/1258	4.74	4.50	4.38	4.44	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	190/ 873	4.40	4.39	4.03	4.04	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: PHED 202 3
 Title Intro To Health Behavi
 Instructor: Nicholson,Laure
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1152
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						