Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101 University of Maryland Page 1215 Title BASKETBALL AUG 6, 2008 STERN, PHIL Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Student.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I 0

? 0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

21

		0			1770	377		_	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	5 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain nev	v insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	2	0	0	2	11	4.33	902/1670	4.33	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	207/1666	4.87	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.87
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did wri	itten assi	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
		system clearly		ined	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How mar	ny times v	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.43
9. How wou	ıld you gı	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	888/1626	4.11	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.11
		T a a-b	_															
1 Wara th	o inatru	Lecture stor's lectures		propored	10	0	0	0	0	Λ	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
		or seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.47	5.00
				explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.29	4.72	4.32	4.80
		s contribute to			9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
				our understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	4		1/1323	5.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	
J. DIG auc	ilovisuai	ceciniiques em	lance y	our understanding	O	J	U	U	U	U	-	3.00	1/1323	3.00	1.70	1.00	3.71	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.07	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were al	ll student	s actively en	courage	ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.04	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.31	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		9	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıtioı	1									
				11040	circy	DID		20101	•									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor		8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						<b>J</b>								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 9									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	

Other

4

University of Maryland Baltimore County

? 0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

30

Course-Section: PHED 109 0201 Page 1216 JOGGING AUG 6, 2008 CARNEY, QUINN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		0	_		NID	3.7.7	Fre	-	ncies 3	5	_		ructor	Course	-		Level	
		Question	s 		NK	NA				4	5	Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	5	3	1	2	5	2.94	1630/1670	2.95	3.96	4.31	4.23	2.94
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	10	4.12	1125/1666	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did th	ie exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	15	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1615	3.30	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	5	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	361/1650	4.73	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1416/1667	3.92	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.19
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1312/1626	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1559	2.67	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
		ctor seem inter			12	0	0	1	1	0	3		1467/1560		4.51	4.72	4.68	4.00
				xplained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
		es contribute t			14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	13	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1378		4.04	4.29	4.09	****
		_	_	d open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
		echniques succe			15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
				Frequ	ency	nist	trib	ıt i oı	n									
				_	.01107	220	0112		-									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	9	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 13									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					5						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301 University of Maryland Page 1217 Title JOGGING AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: TRACY, PATRICK Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	23	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescionnaires	43	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

?

0

Enrollment:

34

		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	5	2	7	5	3	2.95	1627/1670	2.95	3.96	4.31	4.23	2.95
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	2	2	3	6	9	3.82	1376/1666	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	21	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	13	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1519/1615	3.30	4.53	4.24	4.17	3.30
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	20	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	8	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	229/1650	4.73	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.80
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	9	13	1	3.65	1643/1667	3.92	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.65
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	0	2	10	2	1	3.13	1523/1626	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.13
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	17	0	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	1535/1559	2.67	4.20	4.46	4.47	2.67
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	16	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1310/1560	4.21	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.43
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	18	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	18	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	19	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Тур	oe e			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 4		Red	 guire		or M	aior	 s 1	6	Graduate		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0							_	-			-	) 0		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	neral	_				0	Under-gr	ad 2	23	Non-	major	23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								-			-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				3	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ah
				P 16									response				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					2	1		3			

#### Course-Section: PHED 111 0101 University of Maryland Page 1218 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BERGER, KELLY

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	6	3	11	8	2	2.90	1635/1670	3.02	3.96	4.31	4.23	2.90
		tor make clear			1	0	0	2	7	7	13		1161/1666		4.37	4.27	4.30	4.07
		estions reflec			0	27	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	23	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	23	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	19	4	3	1	0	1	2.00	1515/1528	2.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	2.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	10	2	2	3	2	10	3.84	1309/1650	4.08	4.61	4.22	4.28	3.84
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	4	6	14	6	3.73	1636/1667	4.32	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.73
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	4	10	6	2	3.27	1483/1626	3.61	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.27
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			23	0	2	0	1	2	2		****/1559			4.46	4.47	****
		ctor seem inter		3	23	0	0	0	2	4	1		****/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	****
		-		xplained clearly	23	0	1	1	1		3		****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
		es contribute t		-	23	0	1	0	1	3			****/1546		4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	hance y	our understanding	24	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
			_															
		Discus				_		_		_								
				what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1384		3.07	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	28	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1378		4.04	4.29	4.09	****
		_		d open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1378		3.31	4.31	4.08	
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		28	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D		_			m				M	
credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке	ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	30
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	h
				P 18									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
				I 0		Oth	ner					8						

? 0

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201 University of Maryl Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING Baltimore County Instructor: CROSS, ROBERT M Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1219
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	41	
Questionnaires:	24	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

								equer			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil		om this course	1	0	4	3	6	6	4	3.13	1611/1670	3.02	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	870/1666	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	22	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	bute t	to what you learned	0	21	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1528	2.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
	_	g system clearly	_	ained	0	8	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	831/1650	4.08	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.31
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	22		607/1667		4.40	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	1038/1626	3.61	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.95
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1559	****	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
		ctor seem intere			18	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
		-		explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	***
				ed to participate	20	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
				nd open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		20	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
		Field V	Jork															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribut	e to v	what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did yo	u clearl	y understand you	ır eval	luation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
		Self I	aced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	son	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Por	uire				 a 1		 Graduat		0	 Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		rec	1u I I E	u IC	) I IVI	וטנג	o I		Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral					0	Under-q	rad ?	4	Non-	-major	24
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gel	ıcıaı	-				U	onder -9	144 2	1	11011-	ilia JUI	27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.30	•	P 13								-	respons				_	•
				I 0		Oth	ner					2	-		5			
				0 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1220 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnai	Questionnaires:
--	-----------------

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101

38

PHYSICAL FITNESS

FAHEY, KELLY A.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questions									_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course   1 0 0 0 1 7 3 6 3.82 1400/1670 3.66 3.96 4.31 4.23 3.82			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 3 6 8 4.29 919/1666 4.29 4.37 4.27 4.30 4.29 4.3 1.00 4.29 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0			Genera	 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls from	this course	1	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	1400/1670	3.66	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	919/1666	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1568 4.60 4.35 4.07 4.03 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1528 4.50 4.24 4.12 4.00 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 3 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 471/1650 4.71 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.56 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0 0 0 4 7 2 3.85 181/1626 3.98 4.02 4.11 4.07 3.85  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 3 2 2 4 4.11 1249/1559 4.24 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.11 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 3 2 2 5 4.33 1876/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 1876/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 1876/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 0 2 0 3 1 5 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.32 4.32 4.32 4.22 6. Did subject to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  2. Beach 1	3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	1	13	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1406	4.60	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 1 15 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1528 4.50 4.24 4.12 4.00 **** 7 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 3 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 47/1650 4.71 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.56 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0 0 0 4 7 2 3.85 1181/1626 3.98 4.02 4.11 4.07 3.85   Lecture	4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	13	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1615	4.70	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 3 0 0 2 2 1 0 4.57 471/1650 4.71 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.56 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.56 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 4 7 2 3.85 1181/1626 3.98 4.02 4.11 4.07 3.85    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1249/1559 4.24 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.11 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 1376/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1009/1546 4.54 4.33 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1323 4.67 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****    Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 8-10 Maj	5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1566	4.60	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.56 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0 0 4 7 2 3.85 1181/1626 3.98 4.02 4.11 4.07 3.85   Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1249/1559 4.24 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.11 2.0 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 1376/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 3.00 How in the subject 9 0 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 4.00 How in the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1009/1546 4.54 4.33 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1323 4.67 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  *******************************	6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	15				0	1	4.00	****/1528	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   3   2   0   0   4   7   2   3.85   1181/1626   3.98   4.02   4.11   4.07   3.85	7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	.ned	1	3	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	471/1650	4.71	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.57
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1249/1559 4.24 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.11 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 1376/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 3.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1009/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1323 4.67 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 0  28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0  56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1	8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		2			0	0	3	12	4.80	861/1667		4.40	4.67	4.61	4.80
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1249/1559 4.24 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.11 2.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1181/1626	3.98	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.85
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1249/1559 4.24 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.11 2.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 1376/1560 4.60 4.51 4.72 4.68 4.33 3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1009/1546 4.54 4.33 4.32 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1323 4.67 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				_															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 3 1 5 4.22 1002/1549 4.30 4.29 4.31 4.32 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1009/1546 4.54 4.33 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1323 4.67 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 S6-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				_	-			-	-					- ,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1009/1546 4.54 4.33 4.32 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1323 4.67 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****    Discussion					3			-				-							
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1			_																
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0  28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0  56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18  84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1				-										,					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 Seneral 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	9	5	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1323	4.67	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 Seneral 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Diagna	aion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.04 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	1 Did ala	aa diaa			that wou learned	17	0	Λ	Λ	1	Λ	Λ	2 00	****/120/	****	2 07	4 10	2 02	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							-			_	0	1		,					
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1							-				-	_		,					
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Sensor         Graduate 0 Major 0	J. Dia che	LIIDCIAC	cor encourage	Lair and	open arbeabaton	Ι,	O	U	O	O	O	_	3.00	71370		3.31	1.51	1.00	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1					Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	a 1'. =	,	a an-						_					_					
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 18 Non-major 18 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	
28-55	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 I 0 Other 1	28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			,								
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 11 I 0 Other 1	56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
P 11 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0													-	
I 0 Other 1	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
					P 11									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
? 0					I 0		Otl	ner					1						
					3 0														

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201 University of Maryland Page 1221
Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: BOBB, DAVID 0. Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	22		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Question	ınaire

					T. T. C	eque	LICIC	5		1115	tructor	Course	DCPC	UMBC	псуст	Sect
tions		I	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
 neral																
,skills fr	om this course		0	0	3	3	3	4	3	3.06	1617/1670	3.66	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.06
lear the e	xpected goals		0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1161/1666	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.06
flect the	expected goals		0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.60	4.72	4.32	4.31	***
lect the e	xpected goals		0	14	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1615	4.70	4.53	4.24	4.17	***
tribute to	what you learne	ed	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	4.60	4.35	4.07	4.03	***
ontribute	to what you lear	rned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	***
early expl	ained		0	8	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1650	4.71	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.88
cancelled			0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1458/1667	4.56	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.13
verall tea	ching effectiven	ness	2	2	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1191/1626	3.98	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.83
cture																
tures well	prepared	1	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1559	4.24	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
		1	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560					***
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1549					***
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1546					***
acuasion																
	what vou learne	-d 1	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	***
	-			-	_	-	-	0	2		,					***
				0	2	0	0	0	0		,					***
	H.	requer	ncv	Dist	tribu	ıt i oı	n									
		-		210	01 120											
GPA	Expected Gra	ades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
99 0	A 2			Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajors	s 1	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
99 0	в 0															
99 4	C 0			Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16
49 1	D 0															
				₽1.	ectiv	TO G				0	#### - 1	Meane +	hara s	ro not		rh
00 5	F 0			ET6	=CCT/	/ 5				0	пппп -	ricaris c	TICIC O	TE HOL	. emoug	111
00 5	F 0 P 13			ET6	ECCIV	765				O	respons				_	111
00 5	- 0			Oth		/E5				0					_	,11
	clear the endient the effect the effect the effect the entribute to contribute Learly explicancelled overall teal ectures well interested sented and ute to what iscussion intribute to by encourage fair and entribute to entribute entribute to entribute	s, skills from this course clear the expected goals effect the expected goals felect the expected goals stribute to what you learned contribute to what you learned cancelled overall teaching effectives ecture cures well prepared interested in the subject sented and explained clear at the to what you learned is cussion intribute to what you learned is cussion in the subject cancel fair and open discussion for the sented and explained clear at the sented and open discussion at th	s,skills from this course clear the expected goals effect the expected goals feet the expected goals stribute to what you learned contribute to what you learned cancelled overall teaching effectiveness ecture ctures well prepared interested in the subject sented and explained clearly ate to what you learned discussion intribute to what you learned by encouraged to participate rage fair and open discussion  Frequence GPA Expected Grades  99 0 A 2 99 0 B 0	clear the expected goals 0 eflect the expected goals 0 expected explained 0 early explained 0 early explained 10 early explained 10 expected effectiveness 2 ecture extures well prepared 14 expected in the subject 14 expected and explained clearly 14 expected and explained clearly 14 expected explained 14 expected expected expected 14 expected e	clear the expected goals 0 0 eflect the expected goals 0 15 flect the expected goals 0 14 tribute to what you learned 0 15 contribute to what you learned 0 15 contribute to what you learned 0 8 cancelled 0 0 8 concelled 0 14 concelled 14 0 contribute to what you learned 14 0 contribute to what you learned 14 0 concelled 14 0 contribute to what you learned 14 0 contribute to what you lear	Selear the expected goals 0 0 1  eflect the expected goals 0 15 0  eflect the expected goals 0 14 1  thribute to what you learned 0 15 0  contribute to what you learned 0 15 0  early explained 0 8 0  concelled 0 0 0 0  concelled 10 0 0 0  contribute to what you learned 14 0 1  interested in the subject 14 0 0  sented and explained clearly 14 0 2  the to what you learned 14 0 1  iscussion  thribute to what you learned 14 0 2  ty encouraged to participate 14 0 0  rage fair and open discussion 14 0 2  Frequency Distribute 19 0 A 2 Required 19 0 B 0	Selear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 offlect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 offlect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 offlect the expected goals 0 14 1 0 offlect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 offlect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 offlect goals 0 0 0 0 0 offlect goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Specific content of the sequence of the expected goals	Signature	Signature	S, skills from this course 0 0 3 3 3 4 3 3.06 clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 3 5 7 4.06 effect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 flect the expected goals 0 14 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 tribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 2 4.13 concelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 2 4.13 concelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 2 4.13 concelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 2 4.13 concelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 2 4.13 concelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 contribute to what getture courses well prepared 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.50 concerned and open discussion 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0	Section   Sect	Section   Sect	Section   Sect	Second   S	## Specifical Science   0

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301 University of Maryland Title PHYSICAL FITNESS Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Chring 2

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 24

Instructor:

MUMMA, ROBERT S

Page 1222 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	COLLEGE	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	quen 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	1	0	2	0	2	7	11	4 00	1170/1670	2 ((	2 06	4 21	4 00	4 00
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	3 2	7 7	11 14	4.09	1172/1670 595/1666	3.66 4.29	3.96 4.37	4.31 4.27	4.23	4.09 4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.72	4.27	4.30	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.72	4.24	4.17	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.35	4.07	4.17	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	3		4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1			4.68	338/1650	4.71	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5		4.76	909/1667	4.56	4.40		4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	1	1	7		4.25	728/1626		4.02		4.07	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1052/1559	4.24	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.60	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	852/1549	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.78	4.00	3.91	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	3	2		****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	3	2		****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	3	2		****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.50	4.03	3.94	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80		***	3.97	3.99	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced				_										
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301
Title PHYSICAL FITNESS

Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1222 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	14			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101

Title SPORTS OFFICIATING

Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 10

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1223 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies In			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	5		1162/1670		3.96	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	378/1666		4.37	4.27	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	660/1650	4.44	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1427/1560	4.20	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.07	4.10	3.92	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.04	4.29	4.09	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	590/1378	4.60	3.31	4.31	4.08	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	***	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101
Title SPORTS OFFICIATION

Title SPORTS OFFICIATING Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1223 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	5			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101 University of Maryland Title WALKING/JOGGING

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: JANCUSKA, JOHN Enrollment: 45

Questionnaires: 26

Page 1224 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

4 ~ ~ ~ + ~	00,,,,,,,,	Evaluation	Ongetion	~~ ~~
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestron	патге

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	5	6	9	3.64	1494/1670	3.43	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	16	4.28	931/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	860/1406	4.27	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	910/1615	4.40	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	0	1	3		****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	1	1	1	3		****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2 0	0	3	1	3 7	16	4.39	732/1650	4.74	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 6	1	1 1	1 1	4	7	16 6		1216/1667 1181/1626	4.47 4.09	4.40 4.02	4.67 4.11	4.61 4.07	4.44 3.84
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	1			4	,	0	3.04	1101/1020	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	1	1	7		1122/1559	4.29	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	0	8		1163/1560	4.57	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.56	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18 17	0 6	0	1 0	1 1	0	6 2	4.38	879/1546 ****/1323	4.06 ****	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1/	О	U	U	Τ	U	2	4.33	^^^/1323		4.78	4.00	3.91	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	4		****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	0	4		****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	0	4		****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	***	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	***

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101 Title WALKING/JOGGING

Instructor: JANCUSKA, JOHN

Questionnaires: 26

Enrollment: 45 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1224 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	14			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: PHED 133 0301

52

WALKING/JOGGING

PEDERGNANA, ALE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland

Page 1225

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions					Fre	_	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	4	0	7	2	2	3	10	3.29	1592/1670	3.43	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.29
		tor make clear			4	0	4	1	2	2	15		1258/1666		4.37	4.27	4.30	3.96
		estions reflec	_	_	4	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	4.27	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	4	20	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1615	4.40	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	4	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	4	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	3	10	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1650	4.74	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.93
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1667	4.47	4.40	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	4	2	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	659/1626	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.32
		Lectur	_	,	0.0	0	-	0	0	•	_	4 22	/1 5 5 0	4 00	4 00	4 46	4 45	ale ale ale ale
		ctor's lecture	_	_	22	0	1	0	0	0	5		****/1559		4.20	4.46	4.47	****
		tor seem inter		-	21	0	0	0	1	1	5		1188/1560		4.51	4.72	4.68	4.57 ****
		_		plained clearly	22	0	0 1	0	0	1	5		****/1549		4.29	4.31	4.32	****
		s contribute t	_		22	•	U T	0	-	1	4		****/1546		4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did au	diovisual	. techniques en	nance yo	ur understanding	20	5	U	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	24	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were a	ll studen	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
				Frequ	ency	nist	trib	ntio	n									
				11040	circy	DID	CT 130	ac101										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	 guir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	s 1	. – – – – . . 7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			,						,		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	8	Non-	major	28
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D 0													3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 16									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					5	_					
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1226

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHED 133 0401

WALKING/JOGGING

WALKER, TIMOTHY

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	_				_			_	_		4					
		lew insights,ski			0	0	2	3	12	3	-/		1573/1670		3.96	4.31	4.23	3.37
		ctor make clear			Ţ	0	1	Ţ	5	6	13		1125/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.12
	-	uestions reflec		_	0	22	0	0	0	0	5		****/1406	4.27	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
		uations reflect			0	20	0	1	0	0	6		477/1615	4.40	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.57
				what you learned	0	22	0	0	0	0	5		****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
		_		o what you learned	1	22	0	0	0	0	4		****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
	_	g system clearl	-	ined	1	9	0	0	0	2	15		173/1650	4.74	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.88
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	7	13	6		1558/1667	4.47	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.96
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	888/1626	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.11
		Lectur	_				_		•	_	_							
		uctor's lecture			16	0	1	Τ	0	Τ	8		1143/1559		4.20	4.46	4.47	4.27
		ctor seem inter		_	14	0	0	0	3	0	10		1222/1560	4.57	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.54
				xplained clearly	16	0	1	0	1	1	8		864/1549	4.56	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.36
	1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				15	0	2	0	3	1	6		1293/1546	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	17	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
		Discus									_							
				what you learned	23	0	0	0	Τ	0	3		****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	
		_		d open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	0	3		****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	sstul		23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
				_														
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribi	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0										_			_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera.	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	major	27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 17									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5						
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1227 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	6	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaires.	0	Scudenc	Course	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

Course-Section: PHED 136 0101

11

WOMEN'S LACROSSE CONNOR, COURTNE

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1633/1666	2.83	4.37	4.27	4.30	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.60	4.53	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1274/1528	3.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1610/1650	2.75	4.61	4.22	4.28	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1579/1626	2.75	4.02	4.11	4.07	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1559/1559	1.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1560/1560	2.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	2.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1549/1549	1.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	1.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1545/1546	1.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	Λ	Λ	1 00	1382/1384	1.00	3.07	4.10	3.92	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.04	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	0	U	U		1376/1378	1.00	3.31	4.31	4.08	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	-	U	2	U	U	U	U	1.00	13/0/13/0	1.00	3.31	T.JI	1.00	1.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	4			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

#### Course-Section: PHED 137 0101 University of Maryland Page 1228 AUG 6, 2008 Title TENNIS Job IRBR3029 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE

Enrollment:	23				
Questionnaires:	14	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	4.74	3.96	4.31	4 02	4.69
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1 1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	138/1666		4.37	4.31	4.23	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406		4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615		4.53	4.24	4.17	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	0	7		****/1566		4.35	4.24	4.17	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1528		4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	720/1650		4.61	4.12	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	Ω	4		1437/1667		4.40	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	6		278/1626		4.02		4.07	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	U	U	U	J	U	1.07	270/1020	4.31	1.02	4.11	1.07	1.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	4.97	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560		4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	4.77	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	3.33	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	3.33	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.33	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	4.67	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Ge	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		El	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 5									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0		Ot]	her					1						
? 0														

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201 University of Maryland Title TENNIS Baltimore County Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

18

ersity of Maryland Page 1229 Altimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane:	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	10		479/1670		3.96	4.31		4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	155/1666	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	4.96	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0		4.20	706/1566		4.35	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learner		11	0	0	0	0			****/1528		4.24		4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	0	0		4.60	429/1650		4.61		4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	9			1633/1667		4.40	4.67		3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	3 2	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	888/1626	4.51	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.90	276/1559	4.97	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.97	4.51		4.47	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	1	9 7	4.30	,	4.77	4.29	4.72	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	Τ.		4.78	382/1549		4.29	4.31	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	_	0	0	0	0			****/1323		4.33	4.32	3.91	4.70
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/1323		4.70	4.00	3.91	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	3.07	4.10	3.92	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1			1247/1378		4.04		4.09	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0					1255/1378				4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1			179/ 904		4.50		3.94	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	5			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
										- 				

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	6			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title TENNIS Job IRBR3029 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON

Page 1230

	-	,	- I 3
Enrollment:	19		
Questionnaires:	7		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ο	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.74	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	4.96	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.62	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.21	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.51	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.97	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	4.77	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	6			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101 University of Maryland COED CREW Baltimore County

Page 1231 Title AUG 6, 2008 FOARD, RENEE M. Instructor: Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

(	Ouestionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
١,	Juescionnaires.	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

В

С

D

F

Р

I

0

0

0

0

2

0

0

Enrollment:

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

15

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.50	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	5.00
Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	3 3	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0

General

Other

Electives

0

0

Under-grad 4

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major 4

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201 University of Maryland BOWLING

Baltimore County Spring 2008 Title DARCANGELO, MIC Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 14

Page 1232 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	2	7		1216/1670	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	8		1154/1666	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3		****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	2		****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2		****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2		****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	6	2		1639/1667	3.71	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	1	U	2	3	4	3.90	1124/1626	3.90	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4 00	1280/1559	4.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	0	0	4		1427/1560	4.20	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	0	3		1146/1549	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
5. 21d ddd15.15dd1 555m114d55 5midnos 75d1 dhae155dha1ng		_	Ū	Ū	Ü	ŭ	_	3.00	, 1323		1.70	1.00	3.71	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	***	***	4.18	4.47	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
0.10 = 1														
Self Paced	1.0	^	0	0		0	_	F 00	****	الدائد الإيلان		4 64	4 50	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2 1	5.00	****/ 27 ****/ 10	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12 12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10 ****/ 6	****	****	4.84	4.75 4.83	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	Τ	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/			4.92	4.83	

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201 Title

BOWLING

Instructor: DARCANGELO, MIC

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 14

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1232 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA Expected		Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	9			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland

? 0

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101

26

SOCCER (OUTDOOR)

CARINGI, PETE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1233

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire	

Questions								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 2 11 4,35 876/1670 4.38 3.96 4.31 4.23 4.35 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1606 5.00 4.72 4.32 4.33 5.00 4.01 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1606 5.00 4.72 4.32 4.31 5.00 4.01 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 210/1615 4.86 4.53 4.24 4.17 4.86 5.01 disassigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1566 5.00 4.35 4.07 4.03 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 2 11 4,35 876/1670 4.38 3.96 4.31 4.23 4.35 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1606 5.00 4.72 4.32 4.33 5.00 4.01 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1606 5.00 4.72 4.32 4.31 5.00 4.01 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 210/1615 4.86 4.53 4.24 4.17 4.86 5.01 disassigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1566 5.00 4.35 4.07 4.03 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.83 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00																			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 12 4.53 595/1666 4.64 4.37 4.27 4.30 4.53 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.72 4.32 4.31 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 210/1615 4.86 4.53 4.24 4.17 4.86 5. Did assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.17 4.86 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.17 4.86 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.93 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.93 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.61 4.67 4.27 4.28 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1565 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00							_			_	_								
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.72 4.32 4.31 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 210/1615 4.86 4.53 4.24 4.17 4.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1566 5.00 4.35 4.07 4.03 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 127/1650 4.92 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1226/1667 4.28 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.11 4.07 4.27 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 ****  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 ****  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5.00 4.50 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  ***  **Discussion**  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  ***  **Discussion**  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  *						-	-	-	_	-				,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 210/1615 4.86 4.53 4.24 4.17 4.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 17/1568 6.30 4.35 4.07 4.03 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 127/1650 4.92 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.93 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 127/1650 4.92 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1226/1667 4.28 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.11 4.07 4.27    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.53 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 4.00 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91					_	-	-	-	-	-	_			,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1566 5.00 4.35 4.07 4.03 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 127/1650 4.92 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1226/1667 4.28 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.24 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.11 4.07 4.27    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1378 *** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1378 *** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_			_	-		-	-	-	-								
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.24 4.12 4.00 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 127/1650 4.92 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1226/1667 4.28 4.04 4.67 4.61 4.49 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.49 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.40 4.67 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.11 4.07 4.27    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 1.01 the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 1.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4.80 *** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.						-		•	•	-	_	_		-, -					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 127/1650 4.92 4.61 4.22 4.28 4.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1226/1667 4.28 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.44 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.11 4.07 4.27    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1566 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1384 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 4.84 4.85 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5						2		•	-	-	•	_		,					
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1226/1667 4.28 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.44 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.27 704/1626 4.14 4.02 4.11 4.07 4.27  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 ***/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-		_	1		-	-	-	1	5		- ,					
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute 1. Did class discussions contribute 1. Did class discussions contribute 1. Did class discussions 1.					ined	1		•	-	-	1	13							
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly  1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  1. Did the lectures 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  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  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  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  1. Did class discussions  1. Did class discussions  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1. Did class discussions  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2. On 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		-				1		-	-	0	-	7						4.61	4.44
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 2. Distribution 15 credits Earned 15 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	704/1626	4.14	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.27
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 809/1559 4.79 4.20 4.46 4.47 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 **** 2. Distribution 15 credits Earned 15 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.51 4.72 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 **** Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  **Trequency Distribution**  **Credits Earned*** Cum. GPA*** Expected Grades*** Reasons*** Type***  **Prequency Distribution**  **Credits Earned*** Cum. GPA**** Expected Grades*** Reasons*** Type****  **Discussion*** Type**** Majors***  **O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors*** 10 Graduate 0 Major****  **Discussion*** Type******  **Prequency Distribution***  **Prequency Distribution************************************					_		_		_		_	_							
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1549 5.00 4.29 4.31 4.32 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0								-	•	1	1	_							
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1546 5.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					-					-		5		,					
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1323 **** 4.78 4.00 3.91 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			_					-	-	-	-	4		,					
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					-		-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1384 **** 3.07 4.10 3.92 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																			
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.04 4.29 4.09 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	1 5 1 1					1.0	0		•	_	_		F 00		als als als als	2 05	4 10	2 00	ale ale ale ale
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1378 **** 3.31 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0									•	0	-	4		,					
4. Were special techniques successful  14 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 4.50 4.03 3.94 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			_	_						T		_		,					
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			_		d open discussion						-	_		,					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					F		- 54 -	A 10											
00-27					Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	ILIOI	1									
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Peguired for Majors 10 Graduate 0						Maio	 )r	0				
							110	-1				-	-	2_3000	-	-	- 100 ) 0	-	ŭ
30-03 U 2.00-2.33 2 U GENELAL 4 UNGEL-GLAG L/ NON-MAIDLE L/	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0						Ge	nera	l				4	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	17
y y																		5 2	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough					= -		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	7h
P 11 responses to be significant		-		-									-					_	,
I 0 Other 0							Ot:	her					0			5-			

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1234

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHED 144 0201

SOCCER (OUTDOOR)

ADAMS, ANTHONY

Title

Instructor:

Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie: 3		5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1 Did von	ı gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	809/1670	4.38	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.40
-	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	312/1666	4.64	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.75
		estions reflect	_	_	1	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406		4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1615		4.53	4.24	4.17	****
			_	hat you learned	2	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	***
	_	_		what you learned	2	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1528	4.83	4.24	4.12	4.00	***
		system clearly		_	2	6	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1650	4.92	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.92
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		4	0	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	1458/1667	4.28	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	.l teach	ing effectiveness	7	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	953/1626	4.14	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.79	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	plained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00		
		s contribute to	_		14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00		4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	15	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	***
		Discuss																
				hat you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1384		3.07		3.92	***
		-	_	to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1378	4.60	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
		_		l open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	ре			Majors			
00-27	A 4		P.0	 guire				a 1	2	Graduat		0	Majo		0			
28-55	B 0		Ked	Juir	eu ro	JI M	ajui	5 I	2	Graduat	C	U	мајс	JI	U			
56-83	1 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 2	C 0		Ger	neral					3	Under-q	rad ?	0	Non-	-major	20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		GEI	ıcıaı	_				J	onder -g.	ruu 2	U	11011-	iiia jul	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E14	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
P 13						ידר						•	respons				_	
I 0						Otl	ner					1	105FOIID	00 2				
? 1												_						

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

I 0

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: CANTOR, FRED

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1235 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 0 4 4 7 3.82 1400/1670 3.82 3.96 4.31 4.23 3.82 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 6 2 8  $4.00\ 1199/1666\ 4.00\ 4.37\ 4.27\ 4.30\ 4.00$ 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 11 0 1 1 0 3 4.00 1057/1406 4.00 4.72 4.32 4.31 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 1 2 0 2 3.60 1418/1615 3.60 4.53 4.24 4.17 3.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1566 \*\*\*\* 4.35 4.07 4.03 \*\*\*\* 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1528 \*\*\*\* 4.24 4.12 4.00 \*\*\*\* 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 6 0 2 2 2 5 3.91 1278/1650 3.91 4.61 4.22 4.28 3.91 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 0 3 12 4.63 1062/1667 4.63 4.40 4.67 4.61 4.63 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 2 6 3 3 3.50 1384/1626 3.50 4.02 4.11 4.07 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 2 0 4 0 2 3.00 1518/1559 3.00 4.20 4.46 4.47 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 1 1 2 2 3 3.56 1521/1560 3.56 4.51 4.72 4.68 3.56 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 1 1 2 1 2 3.29 1453/1549 3.29 4.29 4.31 4.32 3.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 1 3 0 3 1 1 2.63 1519/1546 2.63 4.33 4.32 4.32 2.63 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 7 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1323 \*\*\*\* 4.78 4.00 3.91 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 3 1 1 0 0 1.60 1377/1384 1.60 3.07 4.10 3.92 1.60 1 0 1 2.20 1365/1378 2.20 4.04 4.29 4.09 2.20 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 3 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 2 0 2 0 1 2.60 1346/1378 2.60 3.31 4.31 4.08 2.60 4. Were special techniques successful 12 4 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\* 904 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.03 3.94 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 28 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.64 4.59 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\* / 27 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.54 4.46 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 1 0 14 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\* / 10 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.84 4.75 \*\*\*\* 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 \*\*\*/ 6 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.92 4.83 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency Distribution Expected Grades Credits Earned Cum. GPA Majors Reasons 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 5 Required for Majors 7 Graduate Major A 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 в 0 56-83 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 17 84-150 9 3.00-3.49 4 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 D 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough Ρ 9 responses to be significant

Other

1

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101 WATERPOLO CRADOCK, CHAD G Instructor:

Title

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Page 1236 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

21 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4							Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did you	u dain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	1	0	4	3	8	4 06	1183/1670	4.06	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.06
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56			4.37	4.27	4.30	4.56
		uestions reflec			1	13	0	0	0	0	3		****/1406		4.72	4.32	4.31	****
	_	uations reflect			1	13	0	0	0	0	3		****/1615		4.53	4.24	4.17	****
				what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	6	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.38
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	451/1626	4.47	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.47
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	959/1559	4.45	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1214/1560	4.55	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.55
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	6	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	960/1549	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.27
		es contribute t	-	6	1	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	1103/1546	4.10	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.10	
5. Did aud	diovisual	our understanding	6	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****		
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	***
				d open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		13	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you	u clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
		Self	Dagod															
1. Did sel	lf-paced			what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı												
a 1'. =		-									_							
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors 	;			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	9	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	0 2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	B 0 C 0		Gor	nerai	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non	-major	17
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0						Gel	ıcıa.	_				J	onder -g	iau I	J	11011-	ilia JUI	Τ,
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						E] 6	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ηh
	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0											-	respons				_	,
I O						Otl	ner					1			5-			
? 1																		

Course-Section: PHED 175 0101 University of Maryland Page 1237 Title ROTC TRAINING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008

Instructor: BALLESTEROS, JO (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.40	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.02	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	5.00
Frequ	Frequency Distribution													

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

# Course-Section: PHED 175 0101 University of Maryland Page 1238 Title ROTC TRAINING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.40	4.67	4.61	5.00

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA		Cum. GPA			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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						