

Course-Section: PHED 105 0101
 Title BASKETBALL
 Instructor: STERN, PHIL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1187
 JUL 2, 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	10	0	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1308/1576	3.82	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	958/1576	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	10	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	912/1342	4.14	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	10	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.27	4.25	4.09	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	13	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	13	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	7	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	1441/1574	4.06	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1101/1493	4.63	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1486	****	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHED 109 0301
 Title JOGGING
 Instructor: TRACY, PATRICK
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1188
 JUL 2, 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	10	0	6	4	7	4	6	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	2	7	5	3	9	3.38	1445/1576	3.38	4.27	4.27	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	18	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	17	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1330/1520	3.60	4.27	4.25	4.09	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	20	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	21	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	8	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	399/1547	4.61	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	1	0	10	15	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	1	1	13	6	0	3.14	1420/1554	3.14	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/1493	****	4.59	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	****/1486	****	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 37 Non-major 37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 20		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 111 0101
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING
 Instructor: BERGER, KELLY
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1189
 JUL 2, 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	16	0	5	2	12	5	4	3.04	1535/1576	3.39	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	1	4	7	5	10	3.70	1330/1576	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.18	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	23	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	25	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	27	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	7	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	339/1547	4.83	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	23	4	4.15	1398/1574	4.57	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	9	12	4	3.80	1132/1554	4.16	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	****/1493	****	4.59	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/1486	4.63	4.45	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

Course-Section: PHED 111 0201
 Title AEROBIC CONDITIONING
 Instructor: CROSS, ROBERT M
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1190
 JUL 2, 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	11	0	1	3	5	2	9	3.75	1345/1576	3.39	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	608/1576	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	16	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	16	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	5	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1547	4.83	4.69	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.57	4.19	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	379/1554	4.16	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1493	****	4.59	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	15						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 118 0101
 Title SWIM CONDITIONING
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1191
 JUL 2, 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	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 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 66 Non-major 66
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 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 121 0101
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS
 Instructor: FAHEY, KELLY A.
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1192
 JUL 2, 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	27	0	1	2	3	4	11	4.05	1124/1576	3.89	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	28	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	222/1576	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	27	14	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	27	17	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	27	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	19	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	27	7	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	98/1547	4.86	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	27	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1063/1574	4.54	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	371/1554	4.34	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	****/1488	4.30	4.41	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	****/1493	4.53	4.59	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	38	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	****/1486	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	****/1489	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.00	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.00	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.00	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****

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	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 48	Non-major 48
84-150	4	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 11			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHED 121 0201
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS
 Instructor: BOBB, DAVID O.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1193
 JUL 2, 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	2	0	1	1	7	3	5	3.59	1417/1576	3.89	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	1107/1576	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	7	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	186/1547	4.86	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1152/1574	4.54	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	924/1554	4.34	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.30	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.53	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1486	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	997/1489	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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 0301
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1194
 JUL 2, 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	8	0	2	0	5	9	12	4.04	1130/1576	3.89	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	7	5	16	4.32	864/1576	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	17	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	20	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	22	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	22	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	9	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	160/1547	4.86	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	942/1574	4.54	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	436/1554	4.34	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	1095/1488	4.30	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1053/1493	4.53	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	806/1486	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1075/1489	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.00	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.00	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: PHED 121 0301
 Title PHYSICAL FITNESS
 Instructor: MUMMA, ROBERT S
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1194
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Required for Majors	16	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	36	Non-major	36
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	19						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 133 0101
 Title WALKING/JOGGING
 Instructor: JANCUSKA, JOHN
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1195
 JUL 2, 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	23	0	2	0	6	5	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.92	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	638/1576	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	17	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	24	15	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	24	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	23	22	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	23	4	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	24	1	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	1033/1574	4.37	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	2	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	702/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	37	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	****/1493	****	4.59	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	****/1486	****	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	37	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 48 Non-major 48
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 10		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 133 0401
 Title WALKING/JOGGING
 Instructor: ALEXANDER, KRIS
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1196
 JUL 2, 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	31	0	1	2	5	1	9	3.83	1299/1576	3.92	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	32	0	1	1	3	0	12	4.24	958/1576	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	34	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	35	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	33	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	34	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	34	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1547	4.86	4.69	4.19	4.10	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	32	0	1	0	1	8	7	4.18	1379/1574	4.37	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	827/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	38	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	****/1493	****	4.59	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	39	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	****/1486	****	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.00	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.69	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0
				P 6	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHED 137 0101
 Title TENNIS
 Instructor: NEAGLE, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1197
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1308/1576	3.96	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	2	13	4.47	653/1576	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1520	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	110/1547	4.52	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	4	7	1	2	2	2.44	1571/1574	2.91	4.19	4.64	4.59	2.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	682/1554	4.27	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.33	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.72	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1486	4.40	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	4.20	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.80	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.80	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.00	4.20	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	12						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 137 0201
 Title TENNIS
 Instructor: HUBBARD, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1198
 JUL 2, 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	2	1	6	6	3.88	1266/1576	3.96	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1058/1576	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1520	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.09	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1465	4.60	4.55	4.12	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	4.60	4.30	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.52	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	5	7	2	1	1	2.13	1572/1574	2.91	4.19	4.64	4.59	2.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	532/1554	4.27	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1155/1488	4.33	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	986/1493	4.72	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	997/1489	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.13	4.17	3.96	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1033/1270	3.80	4.27	4.35	4.09	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1018/1269	3.80	4.07	4.35	4.09	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 9		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 137 0301
 Title TENNIS
 Instructor: NEAGLE, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1199
 JUL 2, 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	7	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1042/1576	3.96	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	608/1576	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	921/1520	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.09	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.55	4.12	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.30	4.14	3.94	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	375/1547	4.52	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1386/1574	2.91	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	860/1554	4.27	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.33	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1125/1493	4.72	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1279	4.20	4.13	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1270	3.80	4.27	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	3.80	4.07	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 7		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHED 139 0101
 Title COED CREW
 Instructor: FOARD, RENEE M.
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1200
 JUL 2, 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	6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	527/1576	4.59	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	336/1576	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	8	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1342	4.78	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	6	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.27	4.25	4.09	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	10	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.55	4.12	4.02	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	5	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	347/1554	4.56	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	370/1488	4.82	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	888/1493	4.76	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.67	4.03	3.91	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	9						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHED 143 0201
 Title BOWLING
 Instructor: RADU, ALYSSA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1201
 JUL 2, 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	5	0	2	0	3	5	9	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	3	1	13	4.44	698/1576	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	13	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	12	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.27	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	14	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	6	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	160/1547	4.85	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1115/1574	4.47	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1270/1493	4.43	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	0	0	4	3.43	1338/1489	3.43	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	1

Course-Section: PHED 144 0101
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)
 Instructor: CARINGI, PETE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1202
 JUL 2, 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	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 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
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	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 144 0201
 Title SOCCER (OUTDOOR)
 Instructor: ADAMS, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1203
 JUL 2, 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	4	2	9	3.68	1374/1576	3.68	3.89	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	2	13	4.26	929/1576	4.26	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	11	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	955/1547	4.13	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	7	6	4	3.58	1552/1574	3.58	4.19	4.64	4.59	3.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	0	4	2	9	3.78	1152/1554	3.78	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	806/1486	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	0	9	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.67	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.13	4.17	3.96	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.27	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.07	4.35	4.09	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 12		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHED 146 0101
 Title WEIGHT TRAIN/PHYS FIT
 Instructor: CANTOR, FRED
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1204
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	2	1	4	3	15	4.12	1073/1576	4.12	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	1023/1576	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	23	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.19	4.64	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1488	****	4.41	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1493	****	4.59	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1486	****	4.45	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 16						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 0						

Course-Section: PHED 164 0101
 Title WATERPOLO
 Instructor: CRADOCK, CHAD G
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1205
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	916/1576	4.29	3.89	4.30	4.11	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1040/1576	4.14	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1520	****	4.27	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1465	****	4.55	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1434	****	4.30	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1547	4.89	4.69	4.19	4.10	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.19	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	518/1554	4.42	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1355/1493	4.25	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.45	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1489	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1277	****	4.67	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1279	****	4.13	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1270	****	4.27	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.07	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.73	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHED 202 0101
 Title: INTRO TO HEALTH BEHAVI
 Instructor: HAMMOND, JESSIC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1206
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	3.89	4.30	4.35	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.50	4.32	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.55	4.12	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.30	4.14	4.06	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.69	4.19	4.22	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.19	4.64	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.41	4.47	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.59	4.73	4.75	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.67	4.03	4.01	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.13	4.17	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.27	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.07	4.35	4.29	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.00	4.05	3.92	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	157/ 234	4.00	4.00	4.23	4.44	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	198/ 240	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.65	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	165/ 232	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.38	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	76/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.72	4.78	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.00	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.00	4.64	4.83	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	70/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.61	4.80	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.21	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.74	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	35/ 48	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.71	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.00	4.73	4.69	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.64	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	0	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	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
					4
					0
					4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	0
?	0		