

Course-Section: PHED 105 1
 Title Basketball
 Instructor: Stern, Phil
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1070
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1354/1447	3.44	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	792/1447	4.31	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.36	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	310/1427	4.64	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	1316/1447	4.13	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	709/1380	4.45	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	965/1170	3.83	4.23	4.38	4.17	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	5							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	7	2	4	2	3	2.56	1439/1447	2.56	3.88	4.31	4.18	2.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	3	2	7	3.33	1361/1447	3.33	4.41	4.27	4.30	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1402	****	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	9	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	9	5	4.06	1343/1447	4.06	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1300/1434	3.31	4.11	4.10	4.10	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1341/1387	3.14	4.40	4.46	4.46	3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1385/1387	2.71	4.52	4.73	4.71	2.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1328/1386	3.00	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1334/1380	2.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.80	4.49	3.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	5.00	4.25	4.26
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	5.00	4.52	3.84
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.50	4.30	3.64
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	5.00	4.43	3.73
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 109 02
 Title Jogging
 Instructor: Tracy,Patrick W
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1071
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	6						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 111 02
 Title Aerobic Conditioning
 Instructor: Gallagher,Andre
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1072
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	2	3	1	5	2.82	1431/1447	2.82	3.88	4.31	4.18	2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	3	6	3.59	1293/1447	3.59	4.41	4.27	4.30	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1402	****	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	228/1427	4.73	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1228/1447	4.29	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1300/1434	3.31	4.11	4.10	4.10	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1317/1387	3.40	4.40	4.46	4.46	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1359/1387	3.60	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1283/1386	3.40	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1270/1380	3.40	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	7						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 01
 Title Physical Fitness
 Instructor: Fahey, Kelly A
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1073
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	2	7	3.53	1333/1447	3.74	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	575/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1402	4.50	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.84	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1101/1447	4.54	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	600/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1030/1387	4.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	431/1386	4.63	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.78	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1193	3.67	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1172	3.60	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	4.25	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.80	4.49	3.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	5.00	4.25	4.26
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	5.00	4.52	3.84
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.50	4.30	3.64
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	5.00	4.43	3.73
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 121 01
 Title Physical Fitness
 Instructor: Fahey, Kelly A
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1073
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 03
 Title Physical Fitness
 Instructor: Mumma, Robert S
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1074
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	7	8	3.95	1108/1447	3.74	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	327/1447	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1241	4.60	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	6	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	154/1427	4.84	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	1008/1447	4.54	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	10	8	4.26	623/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	941/1387	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	1055/1387	4.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	510/1386	4.63	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	181/1380	4.78	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.14	4.02	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1172	3.60	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	553/1182	4.25	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		19	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: PHED 123 1
 Title Sports Officiating
 Instructor: Moore,Jeffrey M
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1075
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1447	4.62	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	89/1447	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.70	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.58	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.59	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	150/1316	4.78	4.36	4.14	3.99	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1427	4.92	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1447	4.69	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1434	4.11	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.92	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	830/1172	3.86	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	979/1182	3.83	4.34	4.35	4.18	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.83	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	18/ 38	4.80	4.80	4.49	3.83	4.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.52	3.84	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.64	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	3.73	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 123 1
 Title Sports Officiating
 Instructor: Moore, Jeffrey M
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1075
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 133 01
 Title Walking/Jogging
 Instructor: Jancuska JR,Joh
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1076
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	7	4	3.43	1356/1447	3.87	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	352/1447	4.72	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	380/1241	4.79	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	494/1402	4.70	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	147/1427	4.85	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1223/1447	4.26	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	0	2	12	1	3.75	1088/1434	4.14	4.11	4.10	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.93	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1081/1387	4.79	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.93	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	463/1380	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 15		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 133 03
 Title Walking/Jogging
 Instructor: Alexander,Krist
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1077
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	2	5	16	4.32	800/1447	3.87	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	23	4.77	238/1447	4.72	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1241	4.79	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	93/1402	4.70	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	92/1427	4.85	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	1275/1447	4.26	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	328/1434	4.14	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	4.93	4.40	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.52	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1386	4.93	4.47	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1380	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.80	4.49	3.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	5.00	4.25	4.26
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	5.00	4.52	3.84
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.50	4.30	3.64
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	5.00	4.43	3.73
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 133 03
 Title Walking/Jogging
 Instructor: Alexander, Krist
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1077
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	11						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 01
 Title Tennis
 Instructor: Steil, Oliver
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1078
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	980/1447	4.22	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	327/1447	4.68	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.82	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	437/1402	4.74	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.56	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.36	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	6	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	147/1427	4.60	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	1182/1447	4.07	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	600/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	566/1387	4.61	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/1387	4.82	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1386	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1380	4.85	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	8	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1193	4.57	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.26	3.96	4.15	3.95	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.60	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.60	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 14		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 137 02
 Title Tennis
 Instructor: Hubbard,Robert
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1079
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	14	4.38	742/1447	4.22	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	249/1447	4.68	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1241	4.82	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1402	4.74	4.58	4.24	4.15	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	409/1358	4.56	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1316	4.67	4.36	4.14	3.99	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	7	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	361/1427	4.60	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	1346/1447	4.07	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	230/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	566/1387	4.61	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.82	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	253/1386	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	204/1380	4.85	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	243/1193	4.57	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	925/1172	4.26	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	691/1182	4.60	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	710/1170	4.60	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****	

Course-Section: PHED 137 02
 Title Tennis
 Instructor: Hubbard,Robert
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1079
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	7						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 03
 Title Tennis
 Instructor: Steil, Oliver
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1080
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	971/1447	4.22	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	413/1447	4.68	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1241	4.82	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.74	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1358	4.56	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	4.67	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	9	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	582/1427	4.60	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	6	9	4	3.80	1414/1447	4.07	4.25	4.69	4.68	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	1010/1434	4.27	4.11	4.10	4.10	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	798/1387	4.61	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.82	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	483/1386	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.85	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	4.57	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	4.26	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	4.60	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	4.60	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 13			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 139 1
 Title Coed Crew
 Instructor: Foard,Renee M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1081
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	667/1447	4.44	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	479/1447	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	658/1241	4.40	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	414/1402	4.57	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	11	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.61	4.19	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	1132/1447	4.44	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	558/1386	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.96	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.23	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	6						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 144 01
 Title Soccer (Outdoor)
 Instructor: Caringi, Peter A
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1082
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	667/1447	4.15	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	479/1447	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	10	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	645/1402	4.38	4.58	4.24	4.15	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	7	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	154/1427	4.79	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1346/1447	3.99	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	230/1434	4.33	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1387	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.52	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1386	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 29	Non-major 29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 6			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 144 02
 Title Soccer (Outdoor)
 Instructor: Adams,Anthony M
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1083
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1206/1447	4.15	3.88	4.31	4.18	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	500/1447	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	4.70	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1402	4.38	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	181/1427	4.79	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1396/1447	3.99	4.25	4.69	4.68	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	849/1434	4.33	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.52	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.96	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.34	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.23	4.38	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.80	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 144 02
 Title Soccer (Outdoor)
 Instructor: Adams,Anthony M
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1083
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 164 1
 Title Waterpolo
 Instructor: Cradock, Chad G
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1084
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	859/1447	4.27	3.88	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.70	4.33	4.25	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1402	****	4.58	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1358	****	4.59	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.36	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.89	4.61	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1060/1447	4.53	4.25	4.69	4.68	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.77	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.14	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1024/1172	3.40	3.96	4.15	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.34	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1100/1170	3.40	4.23	4.38	4.17	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.00	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.80	4.49	3.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	5.00	4.25	4.26
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	5.00	4.52	3.84
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.50	4.30	3.64
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	5.00	4.43	3.73
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PHED 164 1
 Title Waterpolo
 Instructor: Cradock, Chad G
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1084
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	7						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 202 1
 Title Intro To Health Behavi
 Instructor: Hammond, Jessica
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1085
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1222/1447	3.82	3.88	4.31	4.31	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1247/1447	3.71	4.41	4.27	4.23	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	896/1241	4.06	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	943/1402	4.06	4.58	4.24	4.24	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	772/1358	4.06	4.59	4.11	4.12	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.36	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	6	6	3	3.63	1219/1427	3.63	4.61	4.19	4.14	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1346/1447	4.06	4.25	4.69	4.70	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1175/1434	3.63	4.11	4.10	3.97	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1207/1387	3.94	4.40	4.46	4.42	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	1268/1387	4.24	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.47	4.32	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1074/1380	3.94	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	602/1193	4.12	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	302/1172	4.64	3.96	4.15	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	460/1182	4.64	4.34	4.35	4.30	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	687/1170	4.36	4.23	4.38	4.32	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			