```
Course-Section: PHED 109  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1220
Title       JOGGING                         Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S                 Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires: 22                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3   2   6   1  10  3.59 1458/1639  3.58  3.67  4.27  4.08  3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   1   3   3  14  4.43  650/1639  4.32  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  16   0   0   2   0   2  4.00 ****/1397  4.00  3.96  4.28  4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  18   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/1583  4.33  4.04  4.19  4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  18   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 18   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/1504  ****  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   5   0   0   2   5   8  4.40  632/1612  4.51  4.47  4.16  4.10  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  14   8  4.36 1265/1635  4.30  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0   0   0   4   6   6  4.13  806/1579  3.99  3.96  4.08  3.95  4.13

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       13   0   0   0   3   3   3  4.00 1237/1518  4.00  4.16  4.43  4.38  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  12   0   0   0   1   0   9  4.80  802/1520  4.62  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0   0   0   3   5   2  3.90 1182/1517  4.07  4.30  4.27  4.20  3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12   0   0   1   4   2   3  3.70 1259/1550  3.98  4.12  4.22  4.17  3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 8  1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/1398  ****  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/1391  ****  4.17  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/1388  ****  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.01  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      21   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0      A    5      Required for Majors  16    Graduate      0       Major       0
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0      B    1
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General               1    Under-grad   22       Non-major   22
 84-150    5       3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   13                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 109  0201            University of Maryland                       Page 1221
Title      JOGGING                        Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BLANCHARD, IAN              Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires:  24                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   4   1   6   2  10  3.57 1471/1639  3.58  3.67  4.27  4.08  3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   2   1   1   5  14  4.22  895/1639  4.32  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  17   1   0   0   2   3  4.00  973/1397  4.00  3.96  4.28  4.18  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  17   0   1   0   1   4  4.33  697/1583  4.33  4.04  4.19  4.01  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  19   0   0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 19  0   0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/1504  ****  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   7   0   2   0   0  14  4.63  364/1612  4.51  4.47  4.16  4.10  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   1   0  14   7  4.23 1374/1635  4.30  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  1   0   4  11   4  3.85 1094/1579  3.99  3.96  4.08  3.95  3.85


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       15   0   0   1   3   0   5  4.00 1237/1518  4.00  4.16  4.43  4.38  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  15   0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44 1239/1520  4.62  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16  0   0   0   3   0   5  4.25  886/1517  4.07  4.30  4.27  4.20  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    16   0   0   0   3   0   5  4.25  897/1550  3.98  4.12  4.22  4.17  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 6  0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1398  ****  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1391  ****  4.17  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1388  ****  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 21   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.11  3.93  3.71  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A    4      Required for Majors  16    Graduate      0      Major        0
   28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0        B    0                                 
   56-83     0      2.00-2.99    1        C    0      General               0    Under-grad   24      Non-major   24
   84-150    8      3.00-3.49    6        D    0                                 
   Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3        F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   18                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                 5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 111  0101                    University of Maryland                               Page 1222
Title       AEROBIC CONDITIONING                   Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: DARCANGELO, MIC                        Fall  2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires: 20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  3  0  5  8  4  3.50 1497/1639  3.14  3.67 4.27 4.08  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  2  5  2 10  3.90 1262/1639  3.66  4.18 4.22 4.17  3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  19  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1397  ****  3.96 4.28 4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  17  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1583  ****  4.04 4.19 4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 12  1  2  2  1  2  3.13 1402/1532  3.13  3.32 4.01 3.88  3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17 0 1 0 1 1  3.67 ****/1504  ****  3.36 4.05 3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   4  0  2  1  5  8  4.19  892/1612  3.93  4.47 4.16 4.10  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  0  9 10  4.35 1273/1635  4.18  4.50 4.65 4.56  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 2 1 1 6 5 3  3.50 1318/1579  3.42  3.96 4.08 3.95  3.50

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       15   0  1  0  2  1  1  3.20 1466/1518  3.27  4.16 4.43 4.38  3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14   0  1  1  0  2  2  3.50 1492/1520  3.58  4.40 4.70 4.61  3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 1 0 2 1 2  3.50 1347/1517  3.50  4.30 4.27 4.20  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14   0  1  1  2  0  2  3.17 1419/1550  3.17  4.12 4.22 4.17  3.17

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 2 1 0 1 1  2.60 1349/1398  2.60  4.04 4.07 3.85  2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 0 1 2  3.40 1247/1391  3.40  4.17 4.30 4.07  3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 1 1 1 2  3.80 1078/1388  3.80  4.35 4.28 4.01  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 15   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.11 3.93 3.71  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A   6      Required for Majors  15     Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B   0
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   4        C   0      General               0     Under-grad  20      Non-major   20
 84-150    14      3.00-3.49   4        D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   8        F   0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P  13                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                 4
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 111  0201                University of Maryland                      Page 1223
Title        AEROBIC CONDITIONING                Baltimore County                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CARNEY, QUINN                         Fall   2007                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    33
Questionnaires: 22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  4  3 10  4  1  2.77 1622/1639  3.14  3.67  4.27 4.08  2.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  3  2  5  5  6  3.43 1513/1639  3.66  4.18  4.22 4.17  3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  21  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1397  ****  3.96  4.28 4.18  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  10  1  1  3  3  4  3.67 1327/1612  3.93  4.47  4.16 4.10  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  2 18  2  4.00 1497/1635  4.18  4.50  4.65 4.56  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4 0  1  1  8  7  1  3.33 1390/1579  3.42  3.96  4.08 3.95  3.33

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         16  0  0  0  5  0  1  3.33 1449/1518  3.27  4.16  4.43 4.38  3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    16  0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1478/1520  3.58  4.40  4.70 4.61  3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00 ****/1517  3.50  4.30  4.27 4.20  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      18  0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 ****/1550  3.17  4.12  4.22 4.17  ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94 3.84  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  1  0  2  0  1  3.00 ****/1398  2.60  4.04  4.07 3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/1391  3.40  4.17  4.30 4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 ****/1388  3.80  4.35  4.28 4.01  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0      A    2      Required for Majors  17    Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B    0
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0      C    0      General               1    Under-grad  22      Non-major   22
  84-150    14      3.00-3.49   5      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00  10      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   18                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 121  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1224
Title      PHYSICAL FITNESS                   Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BERGER, KELLY                      Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     30
Questionnaires:  23                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  3  3  6  4  6  3.32 1550/1639  3.60  3.67  4.27  4.08  3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  2  1  4  4 11  3.95 1176/1639  4.36  4.18  4.22  4.17  3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  20  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1397  4.56  3.96  4.28  4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  18  1  0  0  0  4  4.20 ****/1583  4.11  4.04  4.19  4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  19  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12  0  1  4  3  2  3.60 1154/1504  3.60  3.36  4.05  3.78  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   3  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  118/1612  4.80  4.47  4.16  4.10  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  3 16  4  4.04 1479/1635  4.45  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  1  4  4  4  2  3.13 1455/1579  4.03  3.96  4.08  3.95  3.13


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        14   0  4  0  2  0  3  2.78 1498/1518  4.06  4.16  4.43  4.38  2.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   12   0  1  3  0  0  7  3.82 1455/1520  4.51  4.40  4.70  4.61  3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14  0  2  1  1  0  5  3.56 1328/1517  4.38  4.30  4.27  4.20  3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     14   0  3  0  1  0  5  3.44 1352/1550  4.06  4.12  4.22  4.17  3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 6  1  1  0  0  2  3.25 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  2  0  0  0  3  3.40 ****/1398  ****  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  2  0  0  0  4  3.67 1177/1391  3.67  4.17  4.30  4.07  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  2  0  0  0  3  3.40 ****/1388  ****  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  17   3  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.11  3.93  3.71  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       22   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   22   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors  18     Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0        B    0
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99   1        C    0        General               0     Under-grad   23      Non-major   23
 84-150    9      3.00-3.49   9        D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   3        F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   16                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 121  0201                 University of Maryland                              Page 1225
Title       PHYSICAL FITNESS                     Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WRIGHT, NICCI                          Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      43
Questionnaires:  27                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean  Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  3  2  4  5 11 3.76 1352/1639  3.60  3.67  4.27  4.08  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  0  1  2 22 4.69  316/1639  4.36  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  17  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  467/1397  4.56  3.96  4.28  4.18  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  17  0  1  2  1  5 4.11  929/1583  4.11  4.04  4.19  4.01  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  21  0  0  2  0  3 4.20 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 21  1  0  1  0  3 3.80 ****/1504  3.60  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1  0  0  2  1 22 4.80  166/1612  4.80  4.47  4.16  4.10  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 14 12 4.46 1175/1635  4.45  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  0  9 14 4.61  283/1579  4.03  3.96  4.08  3.95  4.61

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        15   0  0  0  0  2 10 4.83  315/1518  4.06  4.16  4.43  4.38  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   14   0  0  0  0  1 12 4.92  437/1520  4.51  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15  0  0  0  0  1 11 4.92  141/1517  4.38  4.30  4.27  4.20  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     15   0  0  0  0  5  7 4.58  545/1550  4.06  4.12  4.22  4.17  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 8  0  1  0  0  3 4.25 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23  0  2  1  1  0  0 1.75 ****/1398  ****  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23  0  1  1  0  0  2 3.25 ****/1391  3.67  4.17  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0  1  0  1  1  1 3.25 ****/1388  ****  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  21   3  0  0  1  2  0 3.67 ****/ 958  ****  4.11  3.93  3.71  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    6      Required for Majors  19    Graduate      0     Major       0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    0
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99    3       C    0      General               1    Under-grad   27     Non-major  27
 84-150    12      3.00-3.49    8       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5       F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   17                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 6
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 121  0301                University of Maryland                          Page 1226
Title        PHYSICAL FITNESS                   Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PEDERGNANA, ALE                    Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	4	2	10	3.71	1384/1639	3.60	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	14	4.43	650/1639	4.36	4.18	4.22	4.17	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1397	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1583	4.11	4.04	4.19	4.01	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1532	****	3.32	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1504	3.60	3.36	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	4	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	259/1612	4.80	4.47	4.16	4.10	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	736/1635	4.45	4.50	4.65	4.56	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	548/1579	4.03	3.96	4.08	3.95	4.35
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	720/1518	4.06	4.16	4.43	4.38	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	802/1520	4.51	4.40	4.70	4.61	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	405/1517	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	972/1550	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.17	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1295	****	3.75	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1398	****	4.04	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1391	3.67	4.17	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1388	****	4.35	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.11	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0         A    5          Required for Majors  14    Graduate     0        Major       0
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0         B    0                                     
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   3         C    0          General               0    Under-grad  22        Non-major  22
  84-150    7        3.00-3.49   3         D    0                                     
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   5         F    0          Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   11                                            responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                 5
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 123  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1227
Title       SPORTS OFFICIATING            Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY                   Fall  2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 10                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60   508/1639  4.60  3.67   4.27 4.08  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   316/1639  4.70  4.18   4.22 4.17  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1397  ****  3.96   4.28 4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  1261/1583  3.75  4.04   4.19 4.01  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1532  ****  3.32   4.01 3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6 2 1  0  0  0  1.33  1498/1504  1.33  3.36   4.05 3.78  1.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   166/1612  4.80  4.47   4.16 4.10  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   706/1635  4.88  4.50   4.65 4.56  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  1  4  2  4.14   783/1579  4.14  3.96   4.08 3.95  4.14


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1518  5.00  4.16   4.43 4.38  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1520  5.00  4.40   4.70 4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   198/1517  4.86  4.30   4.27 4.20  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   401/1550  4.71  4.12   4.22 4.17  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 5 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1295  ****  3.75   3.94 3.84  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   625/1398  4.25  4.04   4.07 3.85  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   393/1391  4.75  4.17   4.30 4.07  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  1  1  2  4.25   834/1388  4.25  4.35   4.28 4.01  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 958  ****  4.11   3.93 3.71  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****   4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  53  ****  ****   4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  42  ****  ****   4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   8   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  37  ****  ****   4.58 5.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    2      Required for Majors   8     Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    0
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1      C    1      General               0     Under-grad   10      Non-major  10
 84-150     4      3.00-3.49    1      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    7                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 125  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1228
Title      VOLLEYBALL                         Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   KOCHE, BRIANNA                       Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 14                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   1  10  4.50  615/1639   4.50  3.67  4.27  4.08  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   2  11  4.64  371/1639   4.64  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  10   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1397   ****  3.96  4.28  4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  11   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1583   ****  4.04  4.19  4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  12   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1532   ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12  1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1504   ****  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  10   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1612   5.00  4.47  4.16  4.10  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  10   4  4.29 1326/1635   4.29  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  1  0   0   0   4   2  4.33  569/1579   4.33  3.96  4.08  3.95  4.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33 1021/1518   4.33  4.16  4.43  4.38  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67 1033/1520   4.67  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  214/1517   4.83  4.30  4.27  4.20  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  457/1550   4.67  4.12  4.22  4.17  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  4  0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/1295   ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1398   ****  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1391   ****  4.17  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1388   ****  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A   5      Required for Majors  9      Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B   0
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99   0        C   0      General              2      Under-grad   14      Non-major   14
 84-150    7      3.00-3.49   5        D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   4        F   0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   7                                  responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                0
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 125A 0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1229
Title      VOLLEYBALL                         Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   DEY, BRIANNE                       Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 15                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  3  3  8  4.13 1029/1639  4.13  3.67  4.27  4.08  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  2  5  6  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  14  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1397  ****  3.96  4.28  4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  14  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1583  ****  4.04  4.19  4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  13  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1504  ****  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   7  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  490/1612  4.50  4.47  4.16  4.10  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  1  1 11  2  3.93 1547/1635  3.93  4.50  4.65  4.56  3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  4  3  5  4.08  841/1579  4.08  3.96  4.08  3.95  4.08


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        11   0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 1368/1518  3.75  4.16  4.43  4.38  3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    9   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1033/1520  4.67  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00 1083/1517  4.00  4.30  4.27  4.20  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     11   0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1328/1550  3.50  4.12  4.22  4.17  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1398  ****  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1391  ****  4.17  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1388  ****  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.11  3.93  3.71  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0         A    3        Required for Majors  11    Graduate      0       Major       0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0         B    2
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    2         C    0        General               2    Under-grad   15       Non-major  15
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49    4         D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3         F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    9                                   responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                 1
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 133  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1230
Title     WALKING/JOGGING                    Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  JANCUSKA JR, JO                    Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires:  18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  5  8  1  3  3.00 1599/1639  3.41  3.67  4.27  4.08  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  0  6  3  7  3.88 1274/1639  4.15  4.18  4.22  4.17  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  1  0  1  3  4.20  850/1397  4.20  3.96  4.28  4.18  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  15  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1583  4.17  4.04  4.19  4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  17  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1504  ****  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   6  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  218/1612  4.88  4.47  4.16  4.10  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 16  2  4.11 1447/1635  4.26  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0  0  4  5  5  4.07  847/1579  4.30  3.96  4.08  3.95  4.07


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        11   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29 1069/1518  4.64  4.16  4.43  4.38  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   11   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43 1256/1520  4.55  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  854/1517  4.39  4.30  4.27  4.20  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     11   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  875/1550  4.46  4.12  4.22  4.17  4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 4 0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1398  4.33  4.04  4.07  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1391  5.00  4.17  4.30  4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1388  4.67  4.35  4.28  4.01  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    7         Required for Majors  13   Graduate     0        Major        0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    0
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99   2        C    0         General               2   Under-grad  18        Non-major   18
 84-150     8      3.00-3.49   5        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4        F    0         Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   11                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                 2
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 133  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1231
Title      WALKING/JOGGING                   Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    FAHEY, KELLY A.                 Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 17                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  5  3  7  3.82 1311/1639  3.41  3.67  4.27  4.08  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41  667/1639  4.15  4.18  4.22  4.17  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  881/1583  4.17  4.04  4.19  4.01  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  15  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1532  ****  3.32  4.01  3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1504  ****  3.36  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1612  4.88  4.47  4.16  4.10  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  1  0  6  8  4.40 1235/1635  4.26  4.50  4.65  4.56  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0  0  2  2  9  4.54  352/1579  4.30  3.96  4.08  3.95  4.54


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1518  4.64  4.16  4.43  4.38  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0  0  1  0  0  8  4.67 1033/1520  4.55  4.40  4.70  4.61  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  1  0  0  0  7  4.50  597/1517  4.39  4.30  4.27  4.20  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0  0  1  0  0  7  4.63  500/1550  4.46  4.12  4.22  4.17  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 4  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1295  ****  3.75  3.94  3.84  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  1  0  0  0  5  4.33  560/1398  4.33  4.04  4.07  3.85  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.17  4.30  4.07  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0  0  1  0  5  4.67  496/1388  4.67  4.35  4.28  4.01  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   2  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.11  3.93  3.71  ****


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.01  ****


            Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons               Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    1       A    1      Required for Majors  13      Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    0                                  Under-grad  17      Non-major   17
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99    1       C    0      General              0
  84-150    7      3.00-3.49    3       D    0                                  #### - Means there are not enough
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    4       F    0      Electives            0             responses to be significant
                                        P   12
                                        I    0      Other                2
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 146  0101                    University of Maryland                                      Page 1232
Title         WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT               Baltimore County                                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   TORGE, ANDREW P                     Fall   2007                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:  14                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                         NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   1   0   3   3   7  4.07 1089/1639  4.54 3.67  4.27 4.08  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   2   9  4.43  650/1639  4.71 4.18  4.22 4.17  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  12   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/1397  **** 3.96  4.28 4.18  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  11   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/1583  5.00 4.04  4.19 4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 13  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1532  **** 3.32  4.01 3.88  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1504  5.00 3.36  4.05 3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   3   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  113/1612  4.95 4.47  4.16 4.10  4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1   0   0   0   7   6  4.46 1175/1635  4.73 4.50  4.65 4.56  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   4   2   5  4.09  835/1579  4.55 3.96  4.08 3.95  4.09


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      10   0   0   1   0   0   3  4.25 1094/1518  4.63 4.16  4.43 4.38  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10   0   0   1   0   0   3  4.25 1356/1520  4.63 4.40  4.70 4.61  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0  0   1   0   0   2  4.00 ****/1517  5.00 4.30  4.27 4.20  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   11   0   1   0   0   0   2  3.67 ****/1550  5.00 4.12  4.22 4.17  ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 3 1  0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/1295  5.00 3.75  3.94 3.84  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1398  5.00 4.04  4.07 3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1391  5.00 4.17  4.30 4.07  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1388  5.00 4.35  4.28 4.01  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                     Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2        0.00-0.99   0       A    3        Required for Majors  10    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   14       Non-major   14
 84-150     8        3.00-3.49   5       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   4       F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    9                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 146  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1233
Title       WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT            Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CANTOR, FRED                   Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires:  3                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1639  4.54  3.67  4.27  4.08  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1639  4.71  4.18  4.22  4.17  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1583  5.00  4.04  4.19  4.01  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1504  5.00  3.36  4.05  3.78  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1612  4.95  4.47  4.16  4.10  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1635  4.73  4.50  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1579  4.55  3.96  4.08  3.95  5.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1518  4.63  4.16  4.43  4.38  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1520  4.63  4.40  4.70  4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1517  5.00  4.30  4.27  4.20  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00   1/1550  5.00  4.12  4.22  4.17  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1295  5.00  3.75  3.94  3.84  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1398  5.00  4.04  4.07  3.85  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1391  5.00  4.17  4.30  4.07  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1388  5.00  4.35  4.28  4.01  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/ 958  5.00  4.11  3.93  3.71  5.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1234
Title       INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     51
Questionnaires: 42                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	19	12	7	3.48	1506/1639	3.35	3.67	4.27	4.35	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	13	15	11	3.83	1313/1639	3.91	4.18	4.22	4.27	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	6	12	13	6	3.27	1331/1397	3.82	3.96	4.28	4.39	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	9	20	7	3.66	1331/1583	3.85	4.04	4.19	4.28	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	11	5	6	11	7	2.95	1441/1532	3.35	3.32	4.01	4.09	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	3	11	12	6	3.18	1368/1504	3.38	3.36	4.05	4.09	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	9	12	16	3.98	1083/1612	4.01	4.47	4.16	4.21	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	34	4.76	884/1635	4.77	4.50	4.65	4.63	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	7	20	4	3.81	1125/1579	3.67	3.96	4.08	4.14	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	6	12	19	4.15	1169/1518	4.16	4.16	4.43	4.48	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	3	4	10	21	4.29	1345/1520	4.23	4.40	4.70	4.78	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	4	12	19	4.21	928/1517	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.34	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	9	9	17	4.00	1077/1550	4.02	4.12	4.22	4.33	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	2	9	14	8	3.69	882/1295	3.54	3.75	3.94	4.07	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	4	15	11	3.94	840/1398	4.04	4.04	4.07	4.14	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	3	15	14	4.21	855/1391	4.01	4.17	4.30	4.35	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	6	13	15	4.26	828/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	9	11	8	3.83	563/958	3.96	4.11	3.93	4.00	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1234
Title      INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI           Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)   Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    51
Questionnaires: 42                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    2        0.00-0.99    0       A    17       Required for Majors  4       Graduate     0         Major        0
28-55    0        1.00-1.99    0       B    3
56-83    1        2.00-2.99    0       C    1        General              3       Under-grad   42        Non-major    42
84-150   1        3.00-3.49    0       D    0
Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    2       F    0        Electives            1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                14
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0101              University of Maryland                               Page 1235
Title       INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI          Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                 (Instr. B)      Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      51
Questionnaires:  42                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   2  19  12   7  3.48 1506/1639  3.35  3.67  4.27 4.35 3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1  13  15  11  3.83 1313/1639  3.91  4.18  4.22 4.27 3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   4   6  12  13   6  3.27 1331/1397  3.82  3.96  4.28 4.39 3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   2   3   9  20   7  3.66 1331/1583  3.85  4.04  4.19 4.28 3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  11   5   6  11   7  2.95 1441/1532  3.35  3.32  4.01 4.09 2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  7   3  11  12   6  3.18 1368/1504  3.38  3.36  4.05 4.09 3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   4   9  12  16  3.98 1083/1612  4.01  4.47  4.16 4.21 3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   1   1   5  34  4.76  884/1635  4.77  4.50  4.65 4.63 4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 0  0   7  17   4  3.89 1063/1579  3.67  3.96  4.08 4.14 3.85

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0   0   1   7  12  14  4.15 1175/1518  4.16  4.16  4.43 4.48 4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0   0   1   5  13  15  4.24 1363/1520  4.23  4.40  4.70 4.78 4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0   0   1   6  10  17  4.26  875/1517  4.19  4.30  4.27 4.34 4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   0   0   2   8  11  13  4.03 1067/1550  4.02  4.12  4.22 4.33 4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 3  1   3   6  14   6  3.70  871/1295  3.54  3.75  3.94 4.07 3.69

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   1   3   4  15  11  3.94  840/1398  4.04  4.04  4.07 4.14 3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   0   2   3  15  14  4.21  855/1391  4.01  4.17  4.30 4.35 4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0   0   6  13  15  4.26  828/1388  4.29  4.35  4.28 4.37 4.26
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   3   0   2   9  11   8  3.83  563/ 958  3.96  4.11  3.93 4.00 3.83

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33   7   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10 4.33 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1  0   2   2   0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11 4.47 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 36 3 0  1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.61 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          38   2   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37   3   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18 4.08 ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36 2  0   0   0   3   1  4.25 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.00 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 36 0 1  0   1   3   1  3.50 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 3.00 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 36 0  0   2   0   3   1  3.50 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47 **** ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    36   0   0   0   2   3   1  3.83 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 2.00 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                36   1   0   0   2   2   1  3.80 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 4.00 ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 37   0   0   0   3   1   1  3.60 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 4.78 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37   0   0   0   2   2   1  3.80 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 4.28 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       37   0   0   0   1   3   1  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 **** ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   37   0   0   1   1   2   1  3.60 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 **** ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37   1   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 **** ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0   0   0   3   0   2  3.80 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 3.24 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    37   0   0   0   2   2   1  3.80 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.33 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      37   0   0   0   1   3   1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 **** ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       37   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 1.00 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     37   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 3.00 ****
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0101            University of Maryland                    Page 1235
Title         INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI        Baltimore County                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                   (Instr. B)      Fall  2007                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     51
Questionnaires:  42                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    2       0.00-0.99   0       A   17      Required for Majors  4     Graduate    0       Major        0
 28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0       B    3
 56-83    1       2.00-2.99   0       C    1      General              3     Under-grad  42      Non-major   42
 84-150   1       3.00-3.49   0       D    0
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   2       F    0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               14
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0102            University of Maryland                              Page 1236
Title        INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI       Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  DRISCOLL, CHRIS (Instr. A)   Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires: 33                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	7	10	9	6	3.36	1539/1639	3.35	3.67	4.27	4.35	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	15	11	4.03	1067/1639	3.91	4.18	4.22	4.27	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	13	14	4.32	731/1397	3.82	3.96	4.28	4.39	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	19	10	4.18	862/1583	3.85	4.04	4.19	4.28	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	8	10	7	3.47	1264/1532	3.35	3.32	4.01	4.09	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	14	7	3.76	1051/1504	3.38	3.36	4.05	4.09	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	6	20	4.21	860/1612	4.01	4.47	4.16	4.21	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	24	4.70	968/1635	4.77	4.50	4.65	4.63	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	12	12	2	3.56	1294/1579	3.67	3.96	4.08	4.14	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	8	12	11	3.97	1269/1518	4.16	4.16	4.43	4.48	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	11	12	8	3.79	1460/1520	4.23	4.40	4.70	4.78	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	8	11	13	4.09	1030/1517	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.34	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	9	13	3.91	1161/1550	4.02	4.12	4.22	4.33	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	1	12	7	9	3.56	948/1295	3.54	3.75	3.94	4.07	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	16	9	4.17	688/1398	4.04	4.04	4.07	4.14	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	816/1391	4.01	4.17	4.30	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	571/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	334/ 958	3.96	4.11	3.93	4.00	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0102                University of Maryland                        Page 1236
Title          INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI         Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    DRISCOLL, CHRIS (Instr. A)     Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires:  33                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    20        0.00-0.99   1       A   27         Required for Majors  11       Graduate   0        Major        0
 28-55     2        1.00-1.99   0       B    4
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99   3       C    1         General              0        Under-grad 33       Non-major   33
 84-150    1        3.00-3.49   5       D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   1       F    0         Electives            1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other               17
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0102              University of Maryland                              Page 1237
Title      INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI           Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. B)         Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires: 33                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   7  10   9   6  3.36 1539/1639  3.35  3.67  4.27  4.35  3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   3   4  15  11  4.03 1067/1639  3.91  4.18  4.22  4.27  4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   0   4  13  14  4.32  731/1397  3.82  3.96  4.28  4.39  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   4  19  10  4.18  862/1583  3.85  4.04  4.19  4.28  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   2   5   8  10   7  3.47 1264/1532  3.35  3.32  4.01  4.09  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   3   9  14   7  3.76 1051/1504  3.38  3.36  4.05  4.09  3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   4   2   6  20  4.21  860/1612  4.01  4.47  4.16  4.21  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   1   8  24  4.70  968/1635  4.77  4.50  4.65  4.63  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2   1   0   2  18   4  3.96  955/1579  3.67  3.96  4.08  4.14  3.76

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   1   3   9  17  4.40  947/1518  4.16  4.16  4.43  4.48  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   0   4  12  14  4.33 1318/1520  4.23  4.40  4.70  4.78  4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   5  10  15  4.33  800/1517  4.19  4.30  4.27  4.34  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   2   0   7   7  14  4.03 1062/1550  4.02  4.12  4.22  4.33  3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0   1   2   9   8   9  3.76  838/1295  3.54  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.66

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   0   4  16   9  4.17  688/1398  4.04  4.04  4.07  4.14  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   2   4   7  15  4.25  816/1391  4.01  4.17  4.30  4.35  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   3   5  20  4.61  571/1388  4.29  4.35  4.28  4.37  4.61
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   0   0   0   5  10  13  4.29  334/ 958  3.96  4.11  3.93  4.00  4.29

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.00  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  32  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        32  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     32  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        32  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              Cum. GPA           Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                      Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    20        0.00-0.99    1        A    27        Required for Majors  11      Graduate      0        Major       0
 28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0        B     4
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99    3        C     1        General               0      Under-grad   33        Non-major  33
 84-150    1        3.00-3.49    5        D     0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    1        F     0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P     0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I     0        Other                17
                                          ?     0
```

```
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 14                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	5	1	3.21	1575/1639	3.35	3.67	4.27	4.35	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1294/1639	3.91	4.18	4.22	4.27	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1118/1397	3.82	3.96	4.28	4.39	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1289/1583	3.85	4.04	4.19	4.28	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1152/1532	3.35	3.32	4.01	4.09	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1354/1504	3.38	3.36	4.05	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1221/1612	4.01	4.47	4.16	4.21	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	736/1635	4.77	4.50	4.65	4.63	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1193/1579	3.67	3.96	4.08	4.14	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	1126/1518	4.16	4.16	4.43	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	1305/1520	4.23	4.40	4.70	4.78	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	779/1517	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.34	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	927/1550	4.02	4.12	4.22	4.33	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	1	3	1	5	3.31	1081/1295	3.54	3.75	3.94	4.07	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	770/1398	4.04	4.04	4.07	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1197/1391	4.01	4.17	4.30	4.35	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	944/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	610/ 958	3.96	4.11	3.93	4.00	3.75

```
                                     Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHED 202  0103          University of Maryland                        Page 1239
Title        INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI         Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:               (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  2  5  5  1  3.21 1575/1639  3.35  3.67  4.27  4.35  3.21
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  4  8  2  3.86 1294/1639  3.91  4.18  4.22  4.27  3.86
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  2  5  5  3.86 1118/1397  3.82  3.96  4.28  4.39  3.86
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  3  2  5  4  3.71 1289/1583  3.85  4.04  4.19  4.28  3.71
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  4  7  2  3.64 1152/1532  3.35  3.32  4.01  4.09  3.64
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  1  5  4  2  3.21 1354/1504  3.38  3.36  4.05  4.09  3.21
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  1  4  4  4  3.85 1221/1612  4.01  4.47  4.16  4.21  3.85
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  0 13  4.86  736/1635  4.77  4.50  4.65  4.63  4.86
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  2  5  3  0  3.10 1463/1579  3.67  3.96  4.08  4.14  3.41


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  0  3  3  7  4.07 1213/1518  4.16  4.16  4.43  4.48  4.14
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  1  0  2  1 10  4.36 1305/1520  4.23  4.40  4.70  4.78  4.36
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  3  6  4  3.86 1211/1517  4.19  4.30  4.27  4.34  4.11
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  1  2  4  6  3.93 1144/1550  4.02  4.12  4.22  4.33  4.07
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  3  1  3  2  4  3.23 1109/1295  3.54  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.27


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  0  1  6  4  4.00  770/1398  4.04  4.04  4.07  4.14  4.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  1  3  1  2  5  3.58 1197/1391  4.01  4.17  4.30  4.35  3.58
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  1  0  3  2  6  4.00  944/1388  4.29  4.35  4.28  4.37  4.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                   2   0  2  1  1  2  6  3.75  610/ 958  3.96  4.11  3.93  4.00  3.75


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3       0.00-0.99   0      A   10      Required for Majors  4     Graduate      0      Major       0
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B    2
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99   0      C    1      General              0     Under-grad   14      Non-major  14
  84-150     0       3.00-3.49   0      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1      F    0      Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                7
                                       ?    0
```