Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101

Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY

Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 928 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies Inst				ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect				
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	6	24	4.51	604/1639	4.51	4.44	4.27	4.08	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	12	22	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.47	4.22	4.17	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	7	27	4.69	350/1397	4.69	4.13	4.28	4.18	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	1	2	6	15	4.19	852/1583	4.19	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	10	7	15	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.27	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	576/1504	4.29	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	5	27	4.69	293/1612	4.69	4.60	4.16	4.10	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	33		199/1635	4.97	4.93	4.65	4.56	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	2	6	11	6	3.73	1185/1579	3.73	4.18	4.08	3.95	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	30	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.72	4.43	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	5	26		1136/1520	4.57	4.80	4.70	4.61	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	5	25	4.49	622/1517	4.49	4.57	4.27	4.20	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	1	8	23	4.58	556/1550	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.17	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	2	3	11	13	4.10	577/1295	4.10	4.16	3.94		4.10
Discussion	10		0	-	2		1.4	4 10	E01 /1200	4 10	4 00	4 00	2 05	4 10
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	3	4	14	4.13	721/1398	4.13	4.27	4.07	3.85	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	586/1391	4.54	4.65	4.30	4.07	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14 13	0 8	1 2	0 2	3 4	3	16	4.43	712/1388	4.43	4.61	4.28	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	2	2	4	3	5	3.44	755/ 958	3.44	3.70	3.93	3.71	3.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work		_												
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	***	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101

Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY

Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.

Enrollment: 55
Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 928 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	37	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101

Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE

Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 929 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	c.		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question	ь 										Ralik				Mean	
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	0	3	3	6		1138/1639	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.00
		ctor make clear	-	_	0	0	1	2	0	1	9	4.15	959/1639	4.15	4.47	4.22	4.27	4.15
	_	uestions reflec			0	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	946/1397	4.08	4.13	4.28	4.39	4.08
		uations reflect	-	9	1	3	3	0	1	1	4		1465/1583	3.33	4.02	4.19	4.28	3.33
	_	_		what you learned	0	1 5	2 1	0 1	0 2	4	6	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.27	4.01	4.09	4.00
	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned . Was the grading system clearly explained							0	0	3	2 10	3.38 4.77	1278/1504 207/1612		4.14	4.05	4.09 4.21	3.38 4.77
	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.93	4.16	4.63	5.00
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0 1	0	1	5	5	4.08	841/1579	4.08	4.18	4.08		4.08
J. 110W WOO	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							O	_	3	3	1.00	011/13/5	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.11	1.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	10	4.91	213/1518	4.91	4.72	4.43	4.48	4.91
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.78	4.92
				plained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.50
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.33	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.16	3.94	4.07	4.00
		Discus	aion															
1 Did ala	ace diec			what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	929/1398	3.80	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.80
				to participate	3	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.65	4.30	4.35	4.40
				d open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	0	8	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.30
		echniques succe		open arbeablion	4	4	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	888/ 958		3.70	3.93	4.00	2.80
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
		Field	Words															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribu		nat vou learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
		y understand yo			12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
2													,					
				Frequ	iency	Dis	cribu	utior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27							quire	ed ic	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 1 B 3 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 2						neral	1				2	IIndox	rad 1	3	N™o∽	mo i ox	5
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2	D 1		Gei	iera.	L				4	Under-g	Lau I	.3	Non-	major	5
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ectiv	700				1	#### - 1	Meane +	hara s	re not	enous	h
Grau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						=CLI\	/ C S				_	respons				_	11
	I 0						ner					9	respons	a co L	e sign	ıııcdı	1.0	
	\$ 0 T 0					ULI	151					J						
? 0																		

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101

ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR

Title

Instructor: KEENAN, KIP

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 930

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	29	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.47	4.22	4.29	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	175/1397	4.89	4.13	4.28	4.38	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	260/1583	4.74	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.27	4.01	4.07	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.60	4.16	4.18	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	943/1635	4.72	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	0	0	6	17	4.58	302/1579	4.58	4.18	4.08	4.21	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	242/1518		4.72	4.43	4.51	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.80	4.70	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	173/1517	4.88	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	156/1550		4.48	4.22	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	57/1295	4.93	4.16	3.94	4.01	4.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	225/1398		4.27	4.07	4.23	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.65	4.30	4.48	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	351/1388		4.61	4.28	4.50	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	163/ 958	4.65	3.70	3.93	4.24	4.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	^ ~ ~ ~	^ ^ * *	4.52	4.50	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101

Title ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR

Instructor: KEENAN, KIP

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 930 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	20	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	35	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 403 0101 University of Maryland

Page 931 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: (Instr. A) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13				
Ouestionnaires:	35	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 1 13 17 4.36 788/1639 4.36 4.44 4.27 4.42 4.36 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 1
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 1 3
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 0 7 10 14 4.13 992/1639 4.13 4.47 4.22 4.29 4.13 6 13 3 6 3.10 1354/1397 3.10 4.13 4.28 4.38 3.10 6 10 10 3.67 1324/1583 3.67 4.02 4.19 4.31 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 3 1 4 10 14 3.97 828/1532 3.97 4.27 4.01 4.07 3.97 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 3 2 14 11 4.00 824/1504 4.00 4.14 4.05 4.20 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 2 2 1 10 17 4.19 892/1612 4.19 4.60 4.16 4.18 4.19 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 1 30 4.97 265/1635 4.97 4.93 4.65 4.72 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1 2 0 4 12 6 3.83 1109/1579 3.83 4.18 4.08 4.21 3.83 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 0 2 10 20 4.45 877/1518 4.41 4.72 4.43 4.51 4.41 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 7 25 4.73 943/1520 4.68 4.80 4.70 4.75 4.68 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 11 18 4.36 768/1517 4.32 4.57 4.27 4.34 4.32 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 2 4 11 14 4.00 1077/1550 4.00 4.48 4.22 4.24 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 2 0 4 9 9 3.96 677/1295 3.96 4.16 3.94 4.01 3.96 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 3 13 12 4.06 749/1398 4.06 4.27 4.07 4.23 4.06 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 1 7 22 4.61 534/1391 4.61 4.65 4.30 4.48 4.61 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 8 21 4.61 558/1388 4.61 4.61 4.28 4.50 4.61 4. Were special techniques successful 4 6 1 4 9 7 3.56 699/958 3.56 3.70 3.93 4.24 3.56 Laboratory 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.49 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.84 **** 30 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30 0 4 4.80 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.58 **** 0 1 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.71 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 30 0 0 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 30 0 0 1 0 0 4 4.40 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 0 0 4 4.20 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.64 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0 0 Ω 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 4.85 **** 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.51 4.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 34 0 0 34 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 4.67 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum, GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 00 - 270 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 1 Graduate Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 в 7 C 1 56-83 2.00-2.99 0 General Under-grad 27 Non-major 33 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 F 0 1 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 8 3.50-4.00 Electives

Other

11

responses to be significant

Ω

I 0

Course-Section: HAPP 403 0101 University of Maryland

> Questions General

Baltimore County

Page 932 FEB 13, 2008 Title Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 35

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

2. Did	the instru	ew insights,ski ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	7	13 10	17 14	4.36 4.13	788/1 992/1	1639	4.36	4.44	4.27 4.22	4.42	4.36 4.13
		uestions reflec			3	1	3	6	13	3	6		1354/		3.10	4.13	4.28	4.38	3.10
		uations reflect			2	0	1	6	6	10	10		1324/		3.67		4.19	4.31	3.67
				what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	10		3.97	828/		3.97	4.27	4.01	4.07	3.97
				o what you learned	3	1	1 2	3 2	2 1	14 10	11 17	4.00	824/		4.00	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.00 4.19
		g system clearl was class cand		Inea	4	0	0	0	0	10	30	4.19 4.97	892/3 265/3		4.19 4.97	4.60 4.93	4.16 4.65	4.18 4.72	4.19
				hing effectiveness	29	0	0	0	1	3			****/		3.83	4.18	4.08		3.83
J. 110W	would you	_		ning cricectveness	2,5	Ü	Ü	J	-	3	-	1.1,	, -	1375	3.03	1.10	1.00	1.21	3.03
1 Wome	the insta	Lectur uctor's lecture		nwanawad	24	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	989/	1 = 1 0	4.41	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.41
		ctor's lecture			24	0	0	0	1	2	8		1074/		4.41		4.43	4.75	4.41
				xplained clearly	24	0	0	0	3	2			864/		4.32	4.57		4.75	4.32
		es contribute t			24	0	0	2	1	3	5		1077/		4.00	4.48	4.22	4.24	4.00
				our understanding	24	6	0	1	1	1			****/			4.16	3.94		3.96
J. 214	uuu10712uu	_	_	our understanding		· ·	Ü	_		_	-	3.00	, -		3.70	1110	3.71	1.01	3.30
1 1244	alaga dic-	Discus		what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	13	12	4.06	749/	1200	4.06	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.06
				d to participate	4 4	0	0	1	1	13 7	22	4.06	534/		4.06	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.06
				d to participate d open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61			4.61		4.28	4.50	4.61
		echniques succe		d open discussion	4	6	4	1	4	9		3.56				3.70			3.56
1. Well	. special c	-			-	Ü	-	_	•		,	3.30	0,557	,,,,	3.30	3.70	3.75	1.21	3.30
1. Did	the lab in	Labora crease understa	_	f the material	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****
_,			_		-		_			_	-		,						
		Field				_	_				_								
	_			hat you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/	52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****
	-			uation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/		****	****	4.05	4.58	****
		ctor available			30	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/	42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****
	_	could you disc	-	r evaluations ield activities	30 30	0	0 1	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ ****/	٠,	****	****	4.58	4.73	****
5. Dia	Conterence	s neip you carr	y out i	ieid accivicies	30	U	_	U	U	U	7	4.20	, ,	32			4.50	4.04	
1 5 1	1.6	Self			2.4	0	•	•	0	0	-	F 00	ale ale ale ale (F 0	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 45	4 05	4.4.4.4
				what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50	***	***	4.45	4.85	****
		tions make clea ck/tutoring by			34 34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ ****/	32 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****
4. Was	the reedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s neipiui	34	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	***/	32			4.37	4.6/	^ ^ ^ ^
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtio	n										
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s				Тур	e			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Grad	duate	:	8	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	neral	L				6	Unde	er-gr	ad 2	27	Non-	-major	33
84-150		3.00-3.49	4	D 0												_			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1				here a		_	Jh
				P 0		0/1					-	1	res	ponse	s to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Otl	ner				1	.1							
				r u															

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101 University of Maryland Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN

COAKLEY, PAUL E

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 30

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 933

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies Ins			tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	^	0	0	0	2	_	2.2	1 67	120/1620	4 67	1 11	4 07	4 40	4 67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6 1	22 29	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.67 4.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	29 29	4.97 4.97	51/1639	4.97	4.47	4.22	4.29	4.97
 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 				0					65/1397	4.97	4.13		4.38	4.55
	0	1 0	1 0	0	3 0	3	27	4.55	423/1583 105/1532	4.55 4.90	4.02 4.27	4.19 4.01	4.31	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	4		4.52	359/1504	4.52	4.27	4.01	4.07	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	113/1612	4.90	4.14	4.16	4.20	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.93			4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	0	6		4.67	241/1579		4.18	4.08		4.67
J. Now would fou grade the overall teaching critectiveness		_	O	J	O	Ü		1.07	211/13/3	1.07	1.10	1.00	1.21	1.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	110/1517	4.93	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	219/1550	4.87	4.48	4.22	4.24	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	3	1	1	10	3.82	791/1295	3.82	4.16	3.94	4.01	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	242/1398	4.77	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	227/1391	4.91	4.65	4.30	4.48	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	201/1388	4.91	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	2	3	12	4.21	369/ 958	4.21	3.70	3.93	4.24	4.21
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4 40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.10	4.49 4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	1			****	****	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.21	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	2,	U	O	U	O	O	_	3.00	, 100			1.10	1.21	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	***
Cale Darad														
Self Paced	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 50	****	****	1 10	/ OE	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.45 4.51	4.85	****
 Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 	29 29	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.51	4.00 4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29 29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.69	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29 29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.67	****
J. Here there enough proceds for all the students	43	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 21			4.54	4.50	

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101 Title HLTH PLNG & ADM

HLTH PLNG & ADMIN r: COAKLEY, PAUL E

Instructor: COAM Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 30 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 933 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						