

Course-Section: PHED 109 0101  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1270  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	1	5	6	8	3.54	1498/1674	3.54	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	12	4.04	1118/1674	4.04	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	642/1585	4.17	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	767/1535	4.17	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	11	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	151/1651	4.85	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	14	5	4.04	1549/1673	4.04	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	770/1656	4.21	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	795/1586	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	1200/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	339/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	2	2	1	9	4.21	992/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	7	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	567/1380	4.17	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.78	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1004/1511	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHED 109 0101  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1270  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	13	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	14						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: CONNOR, COURTNE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1271  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	3	7	8	10	3.31	1569/1674	3.42	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	4	9	13	3.60	1451/1674	4.04	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	3	1	2	2	5	3.38	1488/1609	3.38	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	8	2	3	1	3	2.35	1518/1535	2.35	4.08	4.08	3.89	2.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	11	1	1	3	6	13	4.21	924/1651	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	28	6	4.14	1497/1673	4.38	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	4	2	9	9	3	3.19	1500/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	2	1	2	2	8	3.87	1382/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	1533/1585	4.26	4.72	4.69	4.60	3.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	3	0	2	4	5	3.57	1381/1582	4.01	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1346/1575	3.96	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	6	0	1	1	0	1.63	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 3	A 6	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 35 Non-major 4
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 24		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: DARCANGELO, MIC  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1272  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	1	3	13	3	3.52	1504/1674	3.42	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	625/1674	4.04	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1609	3.38	4.23	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1585	3.67	4.04	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1535	2.35	4.08	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	393/1651	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	1135/1673	4.38	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	770/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	1104/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.26	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1582	4.01	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	915/1575	3.96	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 17		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHED 113 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SWIMMING  
 Instructor: GIBEAU, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1273  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	13	4.81	233/1674	4.81	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	207/1674	4.81	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1586	4.85	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.92	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	235/1575	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	360/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	602/1511	4.56	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	14						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1274  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1056/1674	4.12	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	763/1674	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1609	4.70	4.23	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1585	****	4.04	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	382/1651	4.78	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	424/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	849/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	808/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 12		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: SALMON, MICHELL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1275  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	0	8	4.08	1131/1674	4.12	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1674	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	4.70	4.23	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.04	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1651	4.78	4.20	4.18	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1470/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1575	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 61	4.67	4.03	4.09	3.87	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	25/ 50	4.67	4.23	4.44	4.39	4.67	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 8		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: Bilger, Matthew  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1276  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	3	5	9	4.11	1115/1674	4.12	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	292/1674	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	645/1609	4.70	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1585	****	4.04	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	454/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	276/1651	4.78	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1189/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	522/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	903/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 10		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		



Course-Section: PHED 125 0201  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: BEALL, J  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1277  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	118/1674	4.92	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	110/1674	4.92	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	16	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	96/1585	4.89	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1535	4.88	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	8	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	70/1651	4.94	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	0	1	6	10	4.16	838/1656	4.16	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1380	4.89	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PHED 125 0201  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: BEALL, J  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1277  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	12						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 125A 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: BLANCHARD, IAN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1278  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	780/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	292/1674	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1609	****	4.23	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1585	****	4.04	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	4.08	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	220/1651	4.76	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	274/1656	4.64	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	723/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	192/1575	4.89	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	1420/1511	3.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 16		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1279  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	3	0	4	6	3	3.38	1553/1674	3.38	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1609	****	4.23	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	****	4.04	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1535	****	4.08	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.93	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1275/1656	3.71	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1391/1586	3.83	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 10		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: Hammond, Jessic  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1280  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	3	5	5	7	3.67	1449/1674	3.91	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	1208/1674	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	962/1423	4.34	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	10	5	3.76	1313/1609	4.20	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	9	6	3.76	1040/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	3	7	6	3.52	1284/1535	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	568/1651	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1463/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	2	9	5	3.84	1169/1656	4.12	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	9	6	3.95	1335/1586	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	1423/1585	4.43	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	10	7	4.15	1034/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	1138/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	5	7	5	3.74	916/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	717/1520	4.55	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	668/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	578/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	456/ 994	4.37	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: Hammond, Jessic  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1280  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 4	A 10	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 202 0102  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: Hammond, Jessic  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1281  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5	6	3	3.53	1504/1674	3.91	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	956/1674	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	950/1423	4.34	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	1018/1609	4.20	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	442/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	757/1535	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	568/1651	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	944/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1073/1656	4.12	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	1144/1586	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1367/1585	4.43	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	632/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	780/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	666/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	379/1520	4.55	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	483/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	358/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	287/ 994	4.37	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 17 Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHED 202 0103  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: Jessell, Jennif  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1282  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	6	14	4.55	558/1674	3.91	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	138/1674	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	195/1423	4.34	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	252/1609	4.20	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	662/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	337/1535	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	208/1651	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1203/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	331/1656	4.12	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	107/1586	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	874/1585	4.43	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	409/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	407/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	167/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	67/1520	4.55	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	372/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	244/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	151/ 994	4.37	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	



Course-Section: PHED 202 0103  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: Jessell, Jennif  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1282  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						