

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101  
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY  
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 949  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	523/1649	4.59	4.35	4.28	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	26	4.57	487/1648	4.57	4.39	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	334/1375	4.73	4.48	4.27	4.10	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	4	9	13	4.26	818/1595	4.26	4.30	4.20	4.03	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	9	19	4.26	624/1533	4.26	4.21	4.04	3.87	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	675/1512	4.26	4.18	4.10	3.86	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.44	4.16	4.08	4.75		
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	34	4.91	597/1646	4.91	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	886/1621	4.05	4.13	4.06	3.96	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	2	30	4.64	683/1568	4.64	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	6	26	4.56	1193/1572	4.56	4.62	4.70	4.64	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	8	24	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.39	4.28	4.20	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	434/1559	4.72	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	3	3	0	10	14	3.97	741/1352	3.97	4.18	3.98	3.86	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	602/1384	4.35	4.49	4.08	3.86	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	818/1382	4.27	4.59	4.29	4.03	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	752/1368	4.41	4.62	4.30	4.01	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	4.25	3.95	3.75	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	161/ 288	3.91	3.55	3.68	3.54	3.91	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	2	2	0	5	2	3.27	245/ 312	3.27	3.73	3.68	3.51	3.27	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101  
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY  
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 949  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	21
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	36	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101  
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE  
 Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 950  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	408/1649	4.68	4.35	4.28	4.29	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	336/1648	4.68	4.39	4.23	4.25	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	271/1375	4.77	4.48	4.27	4.37	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.30	4.20	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	399/1533	4.48	4.21	4.04	4.04	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	248/1512	4.69	4.18	4.10	4.14	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.44	4.16	4.21	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.63	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	4.95	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.62	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	169/1564	4.90	4.39	4.28	4.27	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	103/1559	4.95	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.18	3.98	4.07	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	180/1384	4.85	4.49	4.08	3.99	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	455/1382	4.69	4.59	4.29	4.19	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.25	3.95	3.89	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.55	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101  
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE  
 Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 950  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 380 0101  
 Title GLOBAL ISSUES IN HEALT  
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 951  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	3	23	4.55	577/1649	4.55	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	23	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.39	4.23	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	412/1375	4.66	4.48	4.27	4.22	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	20	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.30	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	19	4.52	358/1533	4.52	4.21	4.04	4.05	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	4	1	18	4.46	451/1512	4.46	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	3	21	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.44	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	993/1646	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	331/1621	4.56	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	0	0	3	20	4.42	956/1568	4.42	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.62	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	1	2	21	4.54	620/1564	4.54	4.39	4.28	4.25	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	2	21	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	2	1	18	4.48	331/1352	4.48	4.18	3.98	3.97	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	228/1384	4.78	4.49	4.08	4.11	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.59	4.29	4.37	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.62	4.30	4.39	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	409/ 948	4.10	4.25	3.95	4.00	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.55	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	2	0	6	1	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.73	3.68	3.60	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 380 0101  
 Title GLOBAL ISSUES IN HEALT  
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 951  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101  
 Title ENVNRMTL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: KEENAN, KIP  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 952  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	408/1649	4.68	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	202/1648	4.82	4.39	4.23	4.36	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	283/1375	4.76	4.48	4.27	4.48	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.30	4.20	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	0	1	13	4.24	643/1533	4.24	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	324/1512	4.58	4.18	4.10	4.26	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	272/1623	4.71	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1175/1646	4.53	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.39	4.28	4.40	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	376/1559	4.76	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	152/1352	4.76	4.18	3.98	4.07	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	302/1384	4.69	4.49	4.08	4.35	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.25	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.55	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	105/ 110	3.20	3.20	3.99	4.22	3.20	

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101  
 Title ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: KEENAN, KIP  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 952  
 FEB 11, 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101  
 Title HEALTH REGUL & QUAL IM  
 Instructor: SNYDER, ANNETTE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 953  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	3	5	2	2.83	1627/1649	2.83	4.35	4.28	4.50	2.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	3	5	2	2.72	1620/1648	2.72	4.39	4.23	4.36	2.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	3	4	2.94	1336/1375	2.94	4.48	4.27	4.48	2.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	2	6	3.28	1487/1595	3.28	4.30	4.20	4.36	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	4	3	3	2.88	1478/1533	2.88	4.21	4.04	4.14	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	4	1	5	3.06	1422/1512	3.06	4.18	4.10	4.26	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	4	2	3	2.76	1577/1623	2.76	4.44	4.16	4.27	2.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	2	5	0	0	2.33	1603/1621	2.33	4.13	4.06	4.24	2.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	4	2	5	1	2.80	1546/1568	2.80	4.40	4.43	4.54	2.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1527/1572	3.63	4.62	4.70	4.79	3.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	3	4	3	1	2.60	1541/1564	2.60	4.39	4.28	4.40	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	1	2	4	2	2.92	1498/1559	2.92	4.49	4.29	4.41	2.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	7	0	2	1	2	2.25	1328/1352	2.25	4.18	3.98	4.07	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1181/1384	3.29	4.49	4.08	4.35	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	1122/1382	3.71	4.59	4.29	4.56	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	0	5	5	3.57	1154/1368	3.57	4.62	4.30	4.58	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	826/ 948	3.14	4.25	3.95	4.31	3.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	263/ 555	4.71	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.71	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	219/ 288	3.20	3.55	3.68	3.71	3.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101  
 Title HEALTH REGUL & QUAL IM  
 Instructor: SNYDER, ANNETTE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 953  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	3	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	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 412 0101  
 Title RES METHODS IN HEALTH  
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 954  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	723/1649	4.45	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	2	3	13	4.35	770/1648	4.35	4.39	4.23	4.36	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	581/1375	4.47	4.48	4.27	4.48	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	697/1595	4.35	4.30	4.20	4.36	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	565/1533	4.32	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	2	11	4.05	859/1512	4.05	4.18	4.10	4.26	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	581/1623	4.45	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1356/1646	4.32	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1030/1621	3.93	4.13	4.06	4.24	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	1183/1568	4.18	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	833/1564	4.35	4.39	4.28	4.40	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	389/1352	4.41	4.18	3.98	4.07	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	400/1384	4.56	4.49	4.08	4.35	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	570/1382	4.56	4.59	4.29	4.56	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.62	4.30	4.58	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	179/ 948	4.57	4.25	3.95	4.31	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.55	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	3.73	3.68	3.95	4.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 412 0101  
 Title RES METHODS IN HEALTH  
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 954  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
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	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101  
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 955  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	148/1648	4.90	4.39	4.23	4.36	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.48	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	272/1595	4.71	4.30	4.20	4.36	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	799/1512	4.14	4.18	4.10	4.26	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.44	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	332/1646	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1621	4.85	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.40	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	101/1564	4.95	4.39	4.28	4.40	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	234/1352	4.63	4.18	3.98	4.07	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	90/1384	4.94	4.49	4.08	4.35	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.62	4.30	4.58	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	4.25	3.95	4.31	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	317/ 555	4.43	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.55	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101  
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 955  
 FEB 11, 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						