

Course-Section: PHED 109 0101
 Title JOGGING
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1249
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	0	2	2	4	8	5	3.57	1479/1649	3.51	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	375/1648	4.43	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	4.14	4.08	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1595	4.00	3.97	4.20	4.03	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	4.40	3.64	4.04	3.87	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1623	4.74	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	1193/1646	4.38	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	1	11	5	4.06	886/1621	3.69	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	791/1568	4.42	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1241/1572	4.36	4.32	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.54	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1060/1559	4.19	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	4.40	4.13	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	3.67	3.67	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 11		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHED 109 0201
 Title JOGGING
 Instructor: BLANCHARD, IAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1250
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	6	5	3.45	1511/1649	3.51	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	966/1648	4.43	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	3.97	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	3.64	4.04	3.87	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.67	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	469/1623	4.74	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	1398/1646	4.38	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	8	3	2	3.33	1429/1621	3.69	3.80	4.06	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1096/1568	4.42	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1409/1572	4.36	4.32	4.70	4.64	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1564	4.54	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	966/1559	4.19	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	458/ 555	3.67	3.67	4.29	4.14	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	1	0	0	5	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.50	3.68	3.54	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	7						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING
 Instructor: BERGER, KELLY
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1251
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	9	2	6	3.13	1587/1649	3.07	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	4	10	3.83	1296/1648	3.65	4.09	4.23	4.16	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1595	3.83	3.97	4.20	4.03	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1533	****	3.64	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1512	3.13	3.67	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	11	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	4	7	7	3	3.43	1637/1646	3.77	4.35	4.69	4.67	3.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	9	4	3	3.26	1449/1621	3.34	3.80	4.06	3.96	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1096/1568	4.29	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1521/1572	3.71	4.32	4.70	4.64	3.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	****	4.13	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1309/1384	2.83	3.98	4.08	3.86	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1146/1382	3.67	4.09	4.29	4.03	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1129/1368	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	12						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING
 Instructor: KOENIG, ERIN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1252
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	7	4	2	3.00	1603/1649	3.07	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	10	2	5	3.47	1494/1648	3.65	4.09	4.23	4.16	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1242/1595	3.83	3.97	4.20	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1412/1512	3.13	3.67	4.10	3.86	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	416/1623	4.52	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	1506/1646	3.77	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	7	7	1	3.41	1399/1621	3.34	3.80	4.06	3.96	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	4.29	4.00	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1572	3.71	4.32	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1564	4.00	4.15	4.28	4.20	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1559	4.00	3.91	4.29	4.20	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	2.83	3.98	4.08	3.86	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 11			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS
 Instructor: HEARIN, MARY C
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1253
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	4	3	6	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	743/1648	4.38	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.08	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	3.97	4.20	4.03	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1533	****	3.64	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.25	3.67	4.10	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1623	4.91	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1059/1646	4.64	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	4.14	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.00	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.32	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1479/1559	3.00	3.91	4.29	4.20	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.13	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	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 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 12		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101
 Title WALKING/JOGGING
 Instructor: JANCUSKA JR, JO
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1254
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	4	5	3.82	1335/1649	3.72	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	11	4.35	770/1648	4.31	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1375	****	4.08	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1595	****	3.97	4.20	4.03	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1533	****	3.64	4.04	3.87	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1512	****	3.67	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	957/1623	4.31	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	697/1646	4.82	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	914/1621	4.05	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	4.17	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.32	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1564	4.50	4.15	4.28	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1559	4.17	3.91	4.29	4.20	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 8		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 133 0201
 Title WALKING/JOGGING
 Instructor: FAHEY, KELLY A.
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1255
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	7	4	9	3.63	1457/1649	3.72	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	885/1648	4.31	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1375	****	4.08	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1595	****	3.97	4.20	4.03	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1533	****	3.64	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1512	****	3.67	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	2	1	1	14	4.50	502/1623	4.31	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	859/1621	4.05	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1572	5.00	4.32	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	3.91	4.29	4.20	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	****	4.13	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 24	Non-major 24
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 19			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101
 Title COED CREW
 Instructor: FOARD, RENEE M.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1256
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	3.62	4.28	4.11	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.97	4.20	4.03	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.80	4.06	3.96	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1564/1568	2.00	4.00	4.43	4.39	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1365/1572	4.33	4.32	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.15	4.28	4.20	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	3.91	4.29	4.20	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.13	3.98	3.86	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.86	3.95	3.75	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 2		
			I 0		
			? 2		
					6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 146 0201
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT
 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1257
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	5	5	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	3.62	4.28	4.11	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.09	4.23	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1533	****	3.64	4.04	3.87	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.31	4.16	4.08	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	1426/1646	4.21	4.35	4.69	4.67	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	766/1621	4.18	3.80	4.06	3.96	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1568	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1572	****	4.32	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1564	****	4.15	4.28	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1559	****	3.91	4.29	4.20	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1382	****	4.09	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	4.22	4.30	4.01	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 9			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1258
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	12	3	3.60	1471/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	10	4.12	1043/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	4	11	3.92	1017/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	8	8	3.92	1175/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	10	4	3.52	1235/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	9	6	5	3.44	1298/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	1009/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	597/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	1001/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	6	12	4.12	1220/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	1222/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	780/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	13	4.28	945/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	7	7	10	4.00	690/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	644/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	799/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	639/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	492/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.95	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1259
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	12	3	3.60	1471/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	10	4.12	1043/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	4	11	3.92	1017/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	8	8	3.92	1175/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	10	4	3.52	1235/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	9	6	5	3.44	1298/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	1009/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	597/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1016/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	1243/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	1241/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	812/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	841/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	6	7	9	3.88	836/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	644/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	799/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	639/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	492/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.95	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 202 0102
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: FAHEY, KELLY A. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1260
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	8	8	3	3.19	1574/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	8	7	3.73	1361/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	9	8	3.81	1087/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	13	4	3.68	1323/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	9	8	2	3.12	1415/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	13	6	5	3.46	1287/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	5	12	3.92	1149/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	16	6	4.04	1532/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	3	7	4	4	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	8	7	7	3.75	1401/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	12	8	4.13	1439/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	3.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	10	7	3.88	1235/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	7	7	3.74	1289/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	6	8	10	4.17	582/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	8	8	5	3.77	953/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1065/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	936/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	694/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.52	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				Required for Majors	3
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	26
				Major	0
				Non-major	26
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	15
?	0		

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	5	8	8	3	3.19	1574/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	8	7	3.73	1361/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	9	8	3.81	1087/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	13	4	3.68	1323/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	9	8	2	3.12	1415/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	13	6	5	3.46	1287/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	5	12	3.92	1149/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	16	6	4.04	1532/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1225/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1484/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1549/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	3.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1433/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1460/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	836/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	8	8	5	3.77	953/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1065/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	936/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	694/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	3.52	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 19	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		

I	0	Other	15
?	0		

Course-Section: PHED 202 0103
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: DRISCOLL, CHRIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1262
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	2	0	6	11	7	3.81	1351/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	885/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	992/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	930/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	10	8	3.92	905/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	10	8	3.92	994/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	6	12	4.12	968/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1491/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	15	3	3.95	987/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	1112/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	1419/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	844/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	14	4.31	931/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	6	6	11	4.13	616/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	520/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	732/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	764/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	411/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: PHED 202 0103
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: DRISCOLL, CHRIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1262
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 14	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other 12	

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	0	0	2	0	6	11	7	3.81	1351/1649	3.53	3.62	4.28	4.29	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	885/1648	4.04	4.09	4.23	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	992/1375	3.90	4.08	4.27	4.37	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	930/1595	3.92	3.97	4.20	4.22	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	10	8	3.92	905/1533	3.52	3.64	4.04	4.04	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	10	8	3.92	994/1512	3.61	3.67	4.10	4.14	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	6	12	4.12	968/1623	4.03	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1491/1646	4.36	4.35	4.69	4.63	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	2	13	0	3.75	1192/1621	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.01	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	1191/1568	3.96	4.00	4.43	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	1333/1572	4.17	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	854/1564	4.12	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1098/1559	3.99	3.91	4.29	4.33	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	661/1352	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.07	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	520/1384	4.17	3.98	4.08	3.99	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	732/1382	4.17	4.09	4.29	4.19	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	764/1368	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	411/ 948	3.86	3.86	3.95	3.89	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	3.67	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.50	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: PHED 202 0103
 Title INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1263
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 14	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 12		
			? 0		