

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101  
 Title BASKETBALL  
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1215  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	2	11	4.33	902/1670	4.33	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	207/1666	4.87	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	888/1626	4.11	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.07	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.04	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.31	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 109 0201  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: CARNEY, QUINN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1216  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	5	3	1	2	5	2.94	1630/1670	2.95	3.96	4.31	4.23	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	10	4.12	1125/1666	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1615	3.30	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	361/1650	4.73	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1416/1667	3.92	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1312/1626	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1559	2.67	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1467/1560	4.21	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	Under-grad 16	Non-major 17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives		
				P 13			
				I 0	Other		
				? 0			

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

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301  
 Title JOGGING  
 Instructor: TRACY, PATRICK  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1217  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	2	7	5	3	2.95	1627/1670	2.95	3.96	4.31	4.23	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	6	9	3.82	1376/1666	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1519/1615	3.30	4.53	4.24	4.17	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	229/1650	4.73	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	9	13	1	3.65	1643/1667	3.92	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	10	2	1	3.13	1523/1626	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	1535/1559	2.67	4.20	4.46	4.47	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1310/1560	4.21	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0			
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0			
				P 16			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: BERGER, KELLY  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1218  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	3	11	8	2	2.90	1635/1670	3.02	3.96	4.31	4.23	2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	7	13	4.07	1161/1666	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	27	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	4	3	1	0	1	2.00	1515/1528	2.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	10	2	2	3	2	10	3.84	1309/1650	4.08	4.61	4.22	4.28	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	6	14	6	3.73	1636/1667	4.32	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	4	10	6	2	3.27	1483/1626	3.61	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1559	****	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	****/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	18						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201  
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING  
 Instructor: CROSS, ROBERT M  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1219  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	6	6	4	3.13	1611/1670	3.02	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	870/1666	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1528	2.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	831/1650	4.08	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	607/1667	4.32	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	1038/1626	3.61	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1559	****	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1549	****	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 24
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - 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: FAHEY, KELLY A.  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1220  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	1400/1670	3.66	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	919/1666	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1406	4.60	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1615	4.70	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1566	4.60	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1528	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	471/1650	4.71	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	861/1667	4.56	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1181/1626	3.98	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1249/1559	4.24	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1376/1560	4.60	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1002/1549	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1009/1546	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1323	4.67	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 11			
			I 0	Other	1	
			? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1221  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	3	3	4	3	3.06	1617/1670	3.66	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1161/1666	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.60	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1615	4.70	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	4.60	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1650	4.71	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1458/1667	4.56	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1191/1626	3.98	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1559	4.24	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	4.60	4.51	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1549	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1546	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 13					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1222  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	2	0	3	7	11	4.09	1172/1670	3.66	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	595/1666	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.35	4.07	4.03	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	338/1650	4.71	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	909/1667	4.56	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	728/1626	3.98	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1052/1559	4.24	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.60	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	852/1549	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.78	4.00	3.91	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.50	4.03	3.94	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****



Course-Section: PHED 121 0301  
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS  
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1222  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	14						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101  
 Title: SPORTS OFFICIATING  
 Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1223  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1162/1670	4.10	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	378/1666	4.70	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	660/1650	4.44	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1427/1560	4.20	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.07	4.10	3.92	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.04	4.29	4.09	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	590/1378	4.60	3.31	4.31	4.08	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PHED 123 0101  
 Title: SPORTS OFFICIATING  
 Instructor: MOORE, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1223  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	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	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	5						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1224  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	2	5	6	9	3.64	1494/1670	3.43	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	16	4.28	931/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	860/1406	4.27	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	910/1615	4.40	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	1	3	16	4.39	732/1650	4.74	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	7	16	4.44	1216/1667	4.47	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	1181/1626	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1122/1559	4.29	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1163/1560	4.57	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.56	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	879/1546	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: JANCUSKA, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1224  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	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	26	Non-major	26
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	14						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 133 0301  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1225  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	7	2	2	3	10	3.29	1592/1670	3.43	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	1	2	2	15	3.96	1258/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	4.27	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	20	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1615	4.40	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	10	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1650	4.74	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1667	4.47	4.40	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	659/1626	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1559	4.29	4.20	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.57	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1549	4.56	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1546	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	17	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	28	Non-major	28
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	16						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 133 0401  
 Title WALKING/JOGGING  
 Instructor: WALKER, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1226  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	12	3	7	3.37	1573/1670	3.43	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	6	13	4.12	1125/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1406	4.27	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	477/1615	4.40	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	9	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	173/1650	4.74	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	13	6	3.96	1558/1667	4.47	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	888/1626	4.09	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	1143/1559	4.29	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	1222/1560	4.57	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	864/1549	4.56	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	1293/1546	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 17		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: PHED 136 0101  
 Title WOMEN'S LACROSSE  
 Instructor: CONNOR, COURTNE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1227  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	2	3	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1633/1666	2.83	4.37	4.27	4.30	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.60	4.53	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1274/1528	3.50	4.24	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1610/1650	2.75	4.61	4.22	4.28	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1579/1626	2.75	4.02	4.11	4.07	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1559/1559	1.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1560/1560	2.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	2.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1549/1549	1.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	1.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1545/1546	1.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1382/1384	1.00	3.07	4.10	3.92	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.04	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1376/1378	1.00	3.31	4.31	4.08	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PHED 137 0101  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PEDERGNANA, ALE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1228  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	4.74	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	138/1666	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615	4.96	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1566	4.20	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	720/1650	4.62	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	1437/1667	4.21	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	278/1626	4.51	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	4.97	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	4.77	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	3.33	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	3.33	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.33	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	4.67	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 5				
				I 0	Other	1		
				? 0				

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1229  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	1	10	4.67	479/1670	4.74	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	155/1666	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	4.96	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.35	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	429/1650	4.62	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1633/1667	4.21	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	888/1626	4.51	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.97	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.97	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	936/1549	4.77	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	382/1546	4.93	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	3.07	4.10	3.92	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1247/1378	3.33	4.04	4.29	4.09	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1255/1378	3.33	3.31	4.31	4.08	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.50	4.03	3.94	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301  
 Title TENNIS  
 Instructor: PURYEAR, RAYMON  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1230  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.74	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	4.96	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.62	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.21	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.51	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.97	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	4.77	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 5	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 2	Under-grad 7	Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 6			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101  
 Title COED CREW  
 Instructor: FOARD, RENEE M.  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1231  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.50	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201  
 Title BOWLING  
 Instructor: DARCANGELO, MIC  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1232  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	1154/1666	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	6	2	3.71	1639/1667	3.71	4.40	4.67	4.61	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1124/1626	3.90	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1427/1560	4.20	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1546	****	4.33	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201  
 Title BOWLING  
 Instructor: DARCANDELO, MIC  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1232  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	10	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	9						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101  
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)  
 Instructor: CARINGI, PETE  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1233  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	3	2	11	4.35	876/1670	4.38	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	595/1666	4.64	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	210/1615	4.86	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.24	4.12	4.00	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1650	4.92	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1226/1667	4.28	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	704/1626	4.14	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	809/1559	4.79	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.04	4.29	4.09	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	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 144 0201  
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)  
 Instructor: ADAMS, ANTHONY  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1234  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	3	3	13	4.40	809/1670	4.38	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	312/1666	4.64	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1615	4.86	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1528	4.83	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1650	4.92	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	1458/1667	4.28	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	953/1626	4.14	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.79	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	4.60	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major 20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 13					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 1					



Course-Section: PHED 146 0101  
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT  
 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1235  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	4	7	3.82	1400/1670	3.82	3.96	4.31	4.23	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	2	8	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1418/1615	3.60	4.53	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1278/1650	3.91	4.61	4.22	4.28	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	1062/1667	4.63	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	1384/1626	3.50	4.02	4.11	4.07	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	0	4	0	2	3.00	1518/1559	3.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1521/1560	3.56	4.51	4.72	4.68	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1453/1549	3.29	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1519/1546	2.63	4.33	4.32	4.32	2.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1377/1384	1.60	3.07	4.10	3.92	1.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1365/1378	2.20	4.04	4.29	4.09	2.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1346/1378	2.60	3.31	4.31	4.08	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101  
 Title WATERPOLO  
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1236  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1183/1670	4.06	3.96	4.31	4.23	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	542/1666	4.56	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	****	4.72	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1615	****	4.53	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.35	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	****	4.24	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.61	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.40	4.67	4.61	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	451/1626	4.47	4.02	4.11	4.07	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	959/1559	4.45	4.20	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1214/1560	4.55	4.51	4.72	4.68	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	960/1549	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	1103/1546	4.10	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	****	4.78	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.07	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.04	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	3.31	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.50	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16	Non-major 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 10			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHED 175 0101  
 Title ROTC TRAINING  
 Instructor: BALLESTEROS, JO (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1237  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.40	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.02	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.20	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.51	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.78	4.00	3.91	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 175 0101  
 Title ROTC TRAINING  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1238  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	3.96	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.53	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.24	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.61	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.40	4.67	4.61	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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