

Course Section: PHED 109 0101  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1257  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	3	5	2	4	2.59	1637/1669	3.08	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	16	4.45	620/1666	4.19	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1421	4.25	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1617	4.50	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	123/1647	4.64	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	1	4.05	1508/1668	4.29	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	10	3	3.79	1187/1605	3.97	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	1231/1551	4.45	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.73	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	729/1502	4.43	3.99	4.26	4.06	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.07	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	13						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 109 0201  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: WARNER, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1258  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	2	2	2	6	3.57	1449/1669	3.08	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1206/1666	4.19	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.53	4.24	4.11	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	651/1647	4.64	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1170/1668	4.29	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	810/1605	3.97	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1514	4.40	4.35	4.39	4.32	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1551	4.45	4.57	4.66	4.55	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1503	4.40	4.46	4.24	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1506	4.40	4.42	4.26	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	4.33	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	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	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	5						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 111 0101  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: DARCANDELO, MIC  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1259  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	9	5	7	3.54	1462/1669	3.34	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	984/1666	4.06	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1617	3.17	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	10	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	617/1647	4.18	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	3	10	9	4.04	1508/1668	4.16	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	5	5	6	3.60	1312/1605	3.46	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1292/1514	3.85	4.35	4.39	4.32	3.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	1168/1551	4.54	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1311	3.50	3.93	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	17						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 111 0201  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: SINGELTON, TARA  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1260  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	7	3	3.14	1583/1669	3.34	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1164/1666	4.06	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1492/1617	3.17	4.11	4.15	3.99	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	2	0	1	6	6	3.93	1125/1647	4.18	4.46	4.12	4.06	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	1364/1668	4.16	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	8	4	2	3.31	1436/1605	3.46	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1514	3.85	4.35	4.39	4.32	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1551	4.54	4.57	4.66	4.55	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/1503	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1506	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.93	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	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 1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 4	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 14				
			I 0	Other	4		
			? 0				

Course Section: PHED 112 0101  
 Title BEGINNING SWIMMING  
 Instructor: GARNER, JOSH  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1261  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	1124/1669	4.07	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	12	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	12	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	6	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1514	****	4.35	4.39	4.32	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1551	****	4.57	4.66	4.55	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1503	****	4.46	4.24	4.17	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1506	****	4.42	4.26	4.17	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHED 113 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SWIMMING  
 Instructor: GIBEAU, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1262  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	1	10	4.29	876/1669	4.29	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	206/1666	4.79	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.53	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	334/1647	4.64	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	1087/1668	4.64	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	188/1605	4.73	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.86	3.93	3.85	3.68	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	1				
			? 0						

Course Section: PHED 121 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1263  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	9	4.37	781/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	206/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.90	4.53	4.24	4.11	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1543	3.80	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	232/1647	4.80	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1305/1668	4.31	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	617/1605	4.31	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1514	4.96	4.35	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.93	3.85	3.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	3.99	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.05	4.29	4.07	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHED 121 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1263  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	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	20	Non-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	12						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						



Course Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title: PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: BARROQUEIRO, MI  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1264  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	2	8	16	4.29	876/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	22	4.55	494/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	27	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	4.90	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1617	4.56	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	26	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	112/1647	4.80	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	18	8	4.17	1431/1668	4.31	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	358/1605	4.31	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.96	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	642/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1502	3.67	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1489	4.20	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 29	Non-major 29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 22			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course Section: PHED 121 0301  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1265  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	2	5	3.31	1547/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1617	4.56	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	3.80	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	213/1647	4.80	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1297/1668	4.31	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	857/1605	4.31	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	4.96	4.35	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1502	3.67	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	4.20	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	11						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 123 0101  
 Title: SPORTS OFFICIATING  
 Instructor: PHILYAW, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1266  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	1	5	10	4.41	719/1669	4.41	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	385/1666	4.65	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1287/1555	3.43	3.92	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1372/1543	3.17	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	1394/1668	4.24	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	800/1605	4.15	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1130/1514	4.18	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	604/1503	4.47	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	623/1506	4.53	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	445/1311	4.25	3.93	3.85	3.68	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	604/1490	4.36	3.73	4.05	3.85	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	1148/1502	3.86	3.99	4.26	4.06	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	776/1489	4.43	4.05	4.29	4.07	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	447/1006	4.13	3.91	4.00	3.81	4.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	28/ 58	4.86	4.86	4.22	4.00	4.86	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	22/ 52	4.57	4.57	4.06	3.81	4.57	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	5
?	0		

Course Section: PHED 125 0201  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: BEALL, J  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1267  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	7	4.42	719/1669	4.42	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1438/1668	4.17	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.57	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.57	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.57	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHED 125A 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: BLANCHARD, IAN  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1268  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	5	3	20	4.37	781/1669	4.37	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	20	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	25	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1555	****	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	10	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	313/1647	4.65	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	1106/1668	4.62	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	298/1605	4.61	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	763/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	163/1503	4.87	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	115/1506	4.94	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	2	7	4.09	812/1490	4.09	3.73	4.05	3.85	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	237/1502	4.91	3.99	4.26	4.06	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	467/1489	4.73	4.05	4.29	4.07	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 31
				P 14	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 4
					Other 3

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

Course Section: PHED 133 0101  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1269  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.92	4.00	3.92	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	958/1506	4.20	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.73	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.99	4.26	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.05	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 6	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 12 Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 6		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHED 139 0101  
 Title COED CREW  
 Instructor: FOARD, RENEE M.  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1270  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	11	4.85	175/1669	4.85	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	231/1666	4.77	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1617	****	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.29	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	313/1605	4.58	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1160/1514	4.13	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.57	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1180/1503	3.88	4.46	4.24	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1311/1490	3.13	3.73	4.05	3.85	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	1428/1502	2.88	3.99	4.26	4.06	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1441/1489	2.75	4.05	4.29	4.07	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	322/1006	4.38	3.91	4.00	3.81	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	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 3	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 10			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			



Course Section: PHED 146 0101  
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, CORIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1271  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	1	9	4.73	306/1669	4.61	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	549/1666	4.45	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.92	4.00	3.92	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	4.93	4.46	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1668	4.80	4.17	4.67	4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	4.44	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.67	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1514	****	4.35	4.39	4.32	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1551	****	4.57	4.66	4.55	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1503	****	4.46	4.24	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1506	****	4.42	4.26	4.17	****	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 8						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 0						

Course Section: PHED 146 0201  
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT  
 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1272  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	7	4.50	590/1669	4.61	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	691/1666	4.45	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1617	5.00	4.11	4.15	3.99	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1555	5.00	3.92	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1647	4.93	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.80	4.17	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	725/1605	4.44	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	****	4.35	4.39	4.32	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1551	****	4.57	4.66	4.55	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	****	4.46	4.24	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	****	4.42	4.26	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.93	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	****	3.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1502	****	3.99	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.05	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.91	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1273  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	4	13	7	12	3.54	1467/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	15	15	4.03	1082/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	23	4.41	670/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	7	11	17	4.03	1017/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	10	8	14	3.78	1037/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	10	14	9	3.66	1200/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	3.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	24	4.33	759/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	1	12	23	4.38	1289/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	9	12	8	3.97	987/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	10	9	15	4.09	1177/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	8	12	15	4.20	1361/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	6	11	17	4.32	811/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	7	12	13	4.03	1060/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	9	10	14	4.00	587/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	8	4	16	4.29	667/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	540/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	5	2	21	4.57	622/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	1	7	3	14	4.08	465/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	4.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1273  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 19	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 40 Non-major 40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1274  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	4	13	7	12	3.54	1467/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	15	15	4.03	1082/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	23	4.41	670/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	7	11	17	4.03	1017/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	10	8	14	3.78	1037/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	10	14	9	3.66	1200/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	3.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	24	4.33	759/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	1	12	23	4.38	1289/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	820/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1199/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1319/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	556/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	693/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	470/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	8	4	16	4.29	667/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	540/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	5	2	21	4.57	622/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	1	7	3	14	4.08	465/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	4.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1274  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 19	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 40 Non-major 40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course Section: PHED 202 0102  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: JONES, KHADIJA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1275  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	10	10	4	1	2.44	1654/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	2.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	13	8	2	3.00	1578/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1170/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	3.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	15	5	4	3.06	1506/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	3	13	6	3	2.97	1444/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	2.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	8	9	7	1	2.59	1503/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	2.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	7	12	5	4	3.00	1526/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	6	9	10	5	2	2.63	1661/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	2.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	7	6	4	2	0	2.05	1583/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	10	9	9	1	2	2.23	1496/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	3.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	7	8	8	7	1	2.58	1550/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	3.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	8	8	6	4	2.93	1432/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	12	1	9	5	2	2.45	1465/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	3.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	7	3	3	2	0	2.00	1269/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	7	6	4	1	2.52	1429/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	2.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	8	8	4	3.57	1287/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	7	10	3	3.57	1253/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	3	2	6	8	2	3.19	893/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	3.19	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHED 202 0102  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: JONES, KHADIJA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1275  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						



Course Section: PHED 202 0102  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1276  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	10	10	4	1	2.44	1654/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	2.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	13	8	2	3.00	1578/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1170/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	3.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	15	5	4	3.06	1506/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	3	13	6	3	2.97	1444/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	2.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	8	9	7	1	2.59	1503/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	2.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	7	12	5	4	3.00	1526/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	6	9	10	5	2	2.63	1661/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	2.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	918/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	1076/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	3.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	1397/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	3.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	959/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	1204/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	3.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1072/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	7	6	4	1	2.52	1429/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	2.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	8	8	4	3.57	1287/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	7	10	3	3.57	1253/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	3	2	6	8	2	3.19	893/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	3.19	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHED 202 0102  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1276  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHED 202 0103  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: LEPUS, JENNIFER  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1277  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	4	12	4.14	1064/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	620/1666	3.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	18	4.64	429/1421	4.15	4.53	4.24	4.35	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	684/1617	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.24	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	408/1555	3.59	3.92	4.00	3.96	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	13	4.24	680/1543	3.35	3.75	4.06	4.10	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	334/1647	3.86	4.46	4.12	4.19	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	2	15	4	3.95	1562/1668	3.59	4.17	4.67	4.59	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	473/1605	3.72	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	715/1514	3.83	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1176/1551	3.93	4.57	4.66	4.72	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	537/1503	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	623/1506	3.86	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	389/1311	3.55	3.93	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	261/1490	3.67	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	326/1502	4.23	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	368/1489	4.22	4.05	4.29	4.36	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	360/1006	3.77	3.91	4.00	3.99	4.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHED 202 0103  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: LEPUS, JENNIFER  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1277  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	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 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		