

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101  
 Title BASKETBALL  
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1128  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	1	3	4	12	3.91	1183/1504	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	279/1503	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1453	4.91	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	15	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	13	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	3	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	129/1485	4.84	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	1300/1504	4.22	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	314/1483	4.53	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1418	****	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101  
 Title BASKETBALL  
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1128  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	16						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: DAVIS, MURRAY  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1129  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	14	4.14	1019/1504	3.98	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	6	18	4.31	780/1503	4.40	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	27	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	260/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	18	5	3.93	1445/1504	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	5	12	8	4.12	772/1483	4.16	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	930/1425	4.52	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	790/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1418	4.75	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	896/1416	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	20	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	29	Non-major	3
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	20						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: YEAKEL, MONICA  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1130  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	1	8	11	15	3.82	1234/1504	3.98	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	8	25	4.49	525/1503	4.40	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	31	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	34	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	37	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	37	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	14	1	1	4	2	16	4.29	716/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	30	6	4.08	1392/1504	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	3	17	9	4.21	690/1483	4.16	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	572/1425	4.52	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	878/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	511/1416	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	36	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	40	Non-major	10
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	26						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 112 0101  
 Title BEGINNING SWIMMING  
 Instructor: HIMES, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1131  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	990/1503	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1487/1504	3.33	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1207/1483	3.57	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1117/1425	4.13	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	977/1416	4.13	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	964/1199	3.40	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	1193/1312	2.86	4.12	4.00	3.69	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1162/1303	3.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	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	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	6	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	7						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 113 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SWIMMING  
 Instructor: GIBEAU, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1132  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	594/1504	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	346/1503	4.63	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1186/1504	4.39	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	373/1483	4.47	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.47
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	688/1425	4.58	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	475/1418	4.58	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	221/1416	4.83	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	603/1199	4.09	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.09
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1312	4.63	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
-----														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
-----														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 19	Non-major 1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 13			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: PETTIT, JULIE M  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1133  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	11	4.10	1048/1504	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	437/1503	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	412/1290	4.47	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	200/1485	4.76	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1087/1504	3.86	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	850/1483	3.83	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	634/1425	3.81	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1022/1426	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	426/1418	4.63	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		



Course-Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1134  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	6	2	4	6	9	3.37	1397/1504	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	4	4	13	3.74	1211/1503	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	2	0	0	7	4.33	711/1290	4.47	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	10	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	190/1485	4.76	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	4	11	6	4	3.22	1489/1504	3.86	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	8	8	5	3.65	1175/1483	3.83	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	2	0	2	2	3.00	1367/1425	3.81	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/1426	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	****/1418	4.63	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1416	4.63	4.34	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	4
84-150	17	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	20						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 125 0101  
 Title VOLLEYBALL  
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, SHELBY  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1135  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1038/1504	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	805/1503	4.29	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	795/1485	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	7	7	2	3.59	1475/1504	3.59	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	5	1	3.58	1204/1483	3.58	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1267/1425	3.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1181/1418	3.71	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1357/1416	2.71	4.34	4.26	4.21	2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1233/1312	2.60	4.12	4.00	3.69	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1174/1299	3.20	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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 133 0301  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: HARTMAN, KRISTY  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1136  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	6	9	17	3.79	1248/1504	3.79	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	29	4.62	368/1503	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	31	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	29	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	35	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	7	0	0	2	0	27	4.86	118/1485	4.86	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	26	4.70	953/1504	4.70	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	2	0	3	19	10	4.03	838/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	164/1416	4.88	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	12	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	28
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	25	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 32	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	5



Course-Section: PHED 136 0101  
 Title WOMEN'S LACROSSE  
 Instructor: TRABER, LAUREN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1137  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	725/1504	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	633/1503	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1473/1504	3.69	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1425	****	4.41	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.72	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	****	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	****	4.34	4.26	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	# - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	11						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1138  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	228/1504	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1256/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	670/1485	4.53	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1207/1504	4.14	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	481/1483	4.10	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	0	0	5	3.63	1286/1425	4.31	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	895/1426	4.77	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	380/1416	4.86	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	11	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	14	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	12						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1139  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	763/1504	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	230/1485	4.53	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1445/1504	4.14	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	0	6	3	3.82	1082/1483	4.10	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1425	4.31	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.77	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	4.86	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****



Course-Section: PHED 137 0301  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1139  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	8						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 146 0101  
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT  
 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1140  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	609/1504	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	10	4.38	678/1503	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1485	4.89	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	804/1483	4.08	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	****	4.41	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.72	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	****	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	****	4.34	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	10						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101  
 Title WATERPOLO  
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1141  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	2	5	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1136/1503	3.90	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.50
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1406/1426	3.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						