

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101  
 Title BASKETBALL  
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1099  
 JUN 13, 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	6	5	6	3.74	1265/1481	3.74	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	632/1481	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	425/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	10	7	4.16	1288/1480	4.16	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	403/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 14		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1100  
 JUN 13, 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	7	4	5	3.13	1437/1481	3.13	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	446/1481	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	161/1459	4.80	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.95	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	10	3	3.68	1151/1450	3.68	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 11		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: DAVIS, MURRAY  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1101  
 JUN 13, 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	1	1	3	12	10	4.07	1024/1481	3.63	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	517/1481	4.01	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	718/1249	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	23	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1342	2.57	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	175/1459	4.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	16	10	4.33	1158/1480	4.14	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	296/1450	3.84	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	3.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.14	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1399	4.10	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 19		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	4

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: SINGELTON, TARA  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1102  
 JUN 13, 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	4	6	2	6	3.19	1427/1481	3.63	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	5	5	3.52	1313/1481	4.01	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1249	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1324/1342	2.57	4.12	4.07	3.88	2.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	899/1459	4.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	2	9	7	3.95	1384/1480	4.14	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	3	5	5	1	3.13	1336/1450	3.84	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	3	0	4	1	1	2.67	1391/1409	3.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	2.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1376/1407	4.14	4.77	4.69	4.57	3.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1223/1399	4.10	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1261/1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 9		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 112 0101  
 Title BEGINNING SWIMMING  
 Instructor: HIMES, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1103  
 JUN 13, 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1249	3.75	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1446/1480	3.67	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1030/1450	3.83	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	****	4.46	4.42	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1407	****	4.77	4.69	4.57	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1399	****	4.30	4.26	4.23	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	****	4.35	4.27	4.19	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	12
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	11	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	1	15
			Other	1	Non-major
					5
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: PETTIT, JULIE M  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1104  
 JUN 13, 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	0	6	3	7	3.88	1174/1481	3.82	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	560/1481	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	624/1249	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1123/1424	3.86	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	182/1459	4.61	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	997/1480	4.70	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	281/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	1031/1407	4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	0	0	0	2	2.14	1242/1262	2.14	4.18	4.05	3.77	2.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1136/1259	3.33	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1134/1256	3.33	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 13			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1105  
 JUN 13, 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	2	1	9	7	10	3.76	1254/1481	3.82	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	8	13	4.14	934/1481	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1249	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1424	3.86	4.27	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	26	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	10	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	550/1459	4.61	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	839/1480	4.70	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	5	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	786/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1409	4.60	4.46	4.42	4.36	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1407	4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.23	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.19	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1262	2.14	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1259	3.33	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1256	3.33	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	1
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 13	D 0	Under-grad	30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	2
			P 20	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101  
 Title: SPORTS OFFICIATING  
 Instructor: PRIETO, JERRY  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1106  
 JUN 13, 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	2	3	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1148/1481	3.86	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1427/1480	3.86	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	145/ 249	4.00	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	3.92	4.30	4.00	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	22/ 51	4.33	4.04	4.00	3.44	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	44/ 55	4.00	3.90	4.55	4.48	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	41/ 51	4.50	4.42	4.65	4.63	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.50	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PHED 125 0101  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: BLANCHARD, IAN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1107  
 JUN 13, 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	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	192/1481	4.79	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	11	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	319/1450	4.53	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409	4.82	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	203/1399	4.82	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	17						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 136 0101  
 Title WOMEN'S LACROSSE  
 Instructor: CONNOR, COURTNE  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1108  
 JUN 13, 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	600/1481	4.46	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	155/1481	4.85	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	298/1249	4.70	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	248/1424	4.71	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	217/1459	4.73	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1326/1480	4.09	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	781/1450	4.10	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 8		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1109  
 JUN 13, 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	4	11	4.53	531/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	349/1481	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1424	4.65	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	502/1396	4.25	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	460/1459	4.57	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1274/1480	4.22	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	751/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1152/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	801/1399	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	421/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 12						
			I 0	Other	4				
			? 0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1110  
 JUN 13, 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	0	1	3	12	4.47	587/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	169/1481	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.65	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1396	4.25	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	310/1459	4.57	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1208/1480	4.22	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	8	5	4.00	836/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1399	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 11		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101  
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)  
 Instructor: CARINGI, PETE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1111  
 JUN 13, 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	0	17	4.62	450/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	264/1481	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	196/1249	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	395/1424	4.77	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	156/1396	4.86	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	7	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	715/1480	4.89	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	311/1450	4.53	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	523/1399	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1400	4.64	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 11
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 12		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	1

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 144 0201  
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)  
 Instructor: ADAMS, ANTHONY  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1112  
 JUN 13, 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	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.27	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	4.86	4.07	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1480	4.89	4.64	4.68	4.64	****	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1450	4.53	4.10	4.09	3.97	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	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	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101  
 Title WATERPOLO  
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1113  
 JUN 13, 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	4	5	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.27	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1139/1480	4.36	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	3.80	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101  
 Title WATERPOLO  
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1113  
 JUN 13, 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	2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	8						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						