

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101  
 Title BASKETBALL  
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1125  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	3	2	9	3.83	1254/1522	3.83	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1381	4.83	3.91	4.08	3.93	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	149/1500	4.82	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1062/1517	4.53	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	493/1497	4.42	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1298/1432	3.43	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101  
 Title BASKETBALL  
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1125  
 JUN 26, 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	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	14						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 109 0201  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: SINGLETON, TARA  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1126  
 JUN 26, 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	5	1	3	3.17	1475/1522	3.58	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	358/1522	4.72	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1245/1476	3.98	4.41	4.22	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	519/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	630/1500	4.58	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	438/1517	4.46	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	820/1497	4.31	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.81	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.81	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.54	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1432	4.19	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	3.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1277	4.25	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1269	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	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	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1127  
 JUN 26, 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	2	0	0	1	7	1	9	4.00	1122/1522	3.58	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	233/1522	4.72	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	758/1476	3.98	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	4.33	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	201/1500	4.58	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	14	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.46	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	385/1497	4.31	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.81	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.81	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.54	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.19	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	1	0	3	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	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	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	10						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: CATONE, SCOTT  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1128  
 JUN 26, 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	1	3	7	5	6	3.55	1387/1522	3.64	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	904/1522	4.14	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1034/1381	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.93	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	5	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	387/1500	4.64	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	292/1517	4.63	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	10	4	3.86	1073/1497	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1440	3.88	4.33	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1448	4.00	4.53	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1436	3.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1432	3.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 17		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: CROSS, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1129  
 JUN 26, 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	2	0	2	3	2	7	8	3.73	1310/1522	3.64	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	5	11	4.05	1058/1522	4.14	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	19	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1381	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	287/1500	4.64	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1241/1517	4.63	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	13	4	4.00	898/1497	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1262/1440	3.88	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	1353/1448	4.00	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	2	0	0	5	3.75	1212/1436	3.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	2	0	0	4	3.57	1251/1432	3.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 12		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 112 0101  
 Title BEGINNING SWIMMING  
 Instructor: GARNER, JOSH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1130  
 JUN 26, 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	3	4	7	4.13	1022/1522	4.13	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1500	4.83	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	7	1	4	3.33	1498/1517	3.33	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1105/1497	3.82	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1345/1440	3.60	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1241/1448	4.40	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1350/1436	3.25	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1270/1432	3.50	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 9		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: WRIGHT, NICCI  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1131  
 JUN 26, 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	0	5	6	13	4.08	1074/1522	3.68	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	576/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	660/1500	4.46	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	15	8	4.25	1268/1517	4.20	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	654/1497	3.92	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	931/1440	3.70	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	1089/1448	4.13	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	934/1436	3.81	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1126/1432	3.53	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	8	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 11		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		



Course-Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1132  
 JUN 26, 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	5	3	9	8	3	3.04	1486/1522	3.68	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	7	7	6	3.21	1454/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	3.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	10	1	2	3	2	10	4.00	988/1500	4.46	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	1	19	5	4.00	1389/1517	4.20	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	4	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1215/1497	3.92	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1404/1440	3.70	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1437/1448	4.13	4.53	4.71	4.63	3.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1308/1436	3.81	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1350/1432	3.53	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1132  
 JUN 26, 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	8	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	19						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1133  
 JUN 26, 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	2	0	0	3	5	8	9	3.92	1200/1522	3.68	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	5	15	4.31	824/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	8	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1500	4.46	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1209/1517	4.20	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	7	10	4	3.86	1073/1497	3.92	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1440	3.70	4.33	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1097/1448	4.13	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1436	3.81	4.31	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1432	3.53	4.21	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	17	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	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	19						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101  
 Title: SPORTS OFFICIATING  
 Instructor: PHILYAW, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1134  
 JUN 26, 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	7	4.78	290/1522	4.78	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	604/1381	4.25	3.91	4.08	3.93	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	973/1517	4.63	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.53	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.95	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	4.33	4.02	3.87	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	7
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	5	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	0	9
			Other	1	Non-major
					9
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 125 0101  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: PRIETO, JERRY  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1135  
 JUN 26, 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	5	10	4.56	537/1522	4.52	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	334/1522	4.61	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	4.76	4.51	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	160/1500	4.84	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1028/1517	4.48	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	695/1497	4.36	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1304/1440	3.96	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.42	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.30	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.25	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	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	1	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	12						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 125 0201  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: DEY, BRIANNE  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1136  
 JUN 26, 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	4	2	13	4.47	643/1522	4.52	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	15	4.53	522/1522	4.61	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	509/1285	4.76	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	119/1500	4.84	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1177/1517	4.48	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	385/1497	4.36	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1112/1440	3.96	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.42	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.30	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432	4.25	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	13						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 133 0301  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1137  
 JUN 26, 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	5	3	8	7	15	3.63	1351/1522	3.08	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	3	26	4.32	811/1522	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	26	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	24	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	613/1476	4.42	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	26	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	5	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	232/1500	4.73	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	600/1517	3.98	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	0	3	12	10	4.04	878/1497	3.69	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	179/1436	4.85	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: PHED 133 0301  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1137  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	25						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						



Course-Section: PHED 133 0401  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1138  
 JUN 26, 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	3	5	0	4	2.53	1511/1522	3.08	4.01	4.30	4.14	2.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	1	10	3.79	1253/1522	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.18	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	4.55	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1476	4.42	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	242/1500	4.73	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	4	7	6	1	3.11	1504/1517	3.98	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	8	6	1	3.35	1340/1497	3.69	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1440	4.83	4.33	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1448	4.86	4.53	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1436	4.85	4.31	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1432	4.83	4.21	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 14		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 136 0101  
 Title WOMEN'S LACROSSE  
 Instructor: CONNOR, COURTNE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1139  
 JUN 26, 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	3	3	5	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1174/1476	3.80	4.41	4.22	4.09	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1179/1381	3.44	3.91	4.08	3.93	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	7	1	3.89	1453/1517	3.89	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	957/1436	4.17	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	3.60	3.95	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.40	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.33	4.02	3.87	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 6		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHED 137 0101  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1140  
 JUN 26, 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	3	17	4.85	211/1522	4.71	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	371/1522	4.68	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	650/1285	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1412	4.40	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	10	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	211/1500	4.76	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1284/1517	4.11	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	433/1497	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.68	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	4.84	4.53	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	558/1432	4.54	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	4.33	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 9		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1141  
 JUN 26, 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	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.71	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1522	4.68	4.34	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	98/1500	4.76	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	6	8	0	3.38	1497/1517	4.11	4.29	4.65	4.62	3.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	8	3	4.00	898/1497	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.68	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.84	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.54	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	4.33	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	9	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 13						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1142  
 JUN 26, 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	1	10	4.54	571/1522	4.71	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	726/1522	4.68	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	938/1285	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.40	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1412	4.40	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	387/1500	4.76	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.11	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.68	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	935/1448	4.84	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	415/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	862/1432	4.54	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	408/1221	4.33	4.28	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 4		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

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

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101  
 Title COED CREW  
 Instructor: FOARD, RENEE M.  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1143  
 JUN 26, 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	365/1522	4.73	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	128/1522	4.91	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.41	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	4.17	4.06	4.01	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.28	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.95	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.45	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.26	4.31	4.04	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	1
			P 7		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201  
 Title BOWLING  
 Instructor: KOLESKI, TARA  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1144  
 JUN 26, 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	2	7	4	5	3.53	1394/1522	3.53	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	4	2	8	3.47	1376/1522	3.47	4.34	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1476	****	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	154/1500	4.82	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1094/1440	4.20	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1327/1448	4.17	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1197/1436	3.80	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	7	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 15			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101  
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)  
 Instructor: CARINGI, PETE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1145  
 JUN 26, 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	3	10	4.47	656/1522	4.09	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	12	4.60	432/1522	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1381	****	3.91	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	242/1500	4.86	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	932/1517	4.50	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	189/1497	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	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	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PHED 144 0201  
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)  
 Instructor: ADAMS, ANTHONY  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1146  
 JUN 26, 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	4	0	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1315/1522	4.09	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	545/1522	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1476	4.60	4.41	4.22	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1500	4.86	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1217/1517	4.50	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1020/1497	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.02	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1440	4.86	4.33	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1448	4.89	4.53	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1432	4.75	4.21	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 10		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 146 0101  
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT  
 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1147  
 JUN 26, 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	0	1	2	10	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.41	4.22	4.09	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.91	4.08	3.93	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	275/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	493/1497	4.42	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	1300/1448	4.25	4.53	4.71	4.63	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.28	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1280	****	3.95	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1277	****	4.45	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	****	4.26	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.33	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	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	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 7		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101  
 Title WATERPOLO  
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1148  
 JUN 26, 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	4	2	8	4.29	869/1522	4.29	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	726/1522	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1285	****	4.51	4.30	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.66	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1289/1517	4.21	4.29	4.65	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.02	4.25	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1304/1440	3.75	4.33	4.45	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1402/1448	3.75	4.53	4.71	4.63	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1432	****	4.21	4.29	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	10						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101  
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI  
 Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1149  
 JUN 26, 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	2	3	1	3.25	1464/1522	3.25	4.01	4.30	4.34	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.34	4.26	4.29	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	1123/1285	3.67	4.51	4.30	4.36	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.41	4.22	4.20	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1315/1412	3.13	4.17	4.06	4.00	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1253/1500	3.63	4.66	4.18	4.20	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1343/1517	4.13	4.29	4.65	4.63	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	904/1440	4.43	4.33	4.45	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1097/1448	4.57	4.53	4.71	4.78	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	983/1221	3.33	4.28	3.93	4.02	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280	4.60	3.95	4.10	4.08	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.45	4.34	4.33	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.33	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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