```
Course-Section: HAPP 100  01                     University of Maryland                              Page  819
Title          Survey US Hlth Care Sy            Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Riley,Joyce L                     Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       49
Questionnaires:  26                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                  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  0  6  20  4.77  298/1447  4.77 4.40  4.31 4.18  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  5  20  4.73  270/1447  4.73 4.30  4.27 4.30  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  23  4.88  159/1241  4.88 4.44  4.33 4.25  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   5  0  0  1  6  13  4.60  380/1402  4.60 4.24  4.24 4.15  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  2  0  6  3  14  4.08  756/1358  4.08 4.13  4.11 4.03  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 0 1 2  9  4.38  512/1316  4.38 4.27  4.14 3.99  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  5  21  4.81  154/1427  4.81 4.35  4.19 4.24  4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  25  4.96  194/1447  4.96 4.84  4.69 4.68  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 5 10 7  4.09  802/1434  4.09 4.02  4.10 4.10  4.09


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  1  1  23  4.73  460/1387  4.73 4.44  4.46 4.46  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  2  4  19  4.58 1081/1387  4.58 4.62  4.73 4.71  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  4  19  4.62  496/1386  4.62 4.35  4.32 4.32  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  0  2  23  4.77  326/1380  4.77 4.43  4.32 4.31  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 1 3 4  13  4.38  388/1193  4.38 4.24  4.02 3.99  4.38


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  1  1  2  3  11  4.22  600/1172  4.22 4.27  4.15 3.95  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  1  1  4  12  4.50  553/1182  4.50 4.39  4.35 4.18  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 1 3 5  9  4.22  781/1170  4.22 4.32  4.38 4.17  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  10  2  0  1  3   2  3.38  691/ 800  3.38 3.91  4.06 3.95  3.38


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 189  **** ****  4.34 4.18  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 0 0  2  5.00 ****/ 192  **** ****  4.34 4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 1 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/ 186  **** ****  4.48 4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 187  **** ****  4.33 4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  24   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 168  **** ****  4.20 4.29  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  66  **** ****  4.58 3.95  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 1 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  62  **** ****  4.56 4.08  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  58  **** ****  4.41 3.88  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24   0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  65  **** ****  4.42 3.78  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24   0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  64  **** ****  4.09 3.75  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.49 3.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  36  **** ****  4.25 4.26  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.52 3.84  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  30  **** ****  4.30 3.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24   0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.43 3.73  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.72 4.50  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  21  **** ****  4.57 4.38  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.64 4.65  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  20  **** ****  4.60 4.49  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  15  **** ****  4.61 4.31  ****
```

Enrollment:       49
Questionnaires:  26                                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                        Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 17 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 22 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

```
Course-Section: HAPP 200  01                   University of Maryland                                    Page  820
Title      Hmn Dev Impl Hlth/Dise               Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Canham,Rhonda L                   Spring 2010                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires:  20                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               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  4  2  14  4.50   585/1447  4.50  4.40  4.31  4.31  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  4  1  15  4.55   479/1447  4.55  4.30  4.27  4.23  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3  3  13  4.40   658/1241  4.40  4.44  4.33  4.35  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3  1  2  3  0  10  4.00   976/1402  4.00  4.24  4.24  4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  1  6  11  4.56   312/1358  4.56  4.13  4.11  4.12  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  1  2  10  4.69   212/1316  4.69  4.27  4.14  4.08  4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  1  18  4.85   120/1427  4.85  4.35  4.19  4.14  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  5  14  4.74   868/1447  4.74  4.84  4.69  4.70  4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  1  1  1  5   7  4.07   817/1434  4.07  4.02  4.10  3.97  4.07


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  2  17  4.80   353/1387  4.80  4.44  4.46  4.42  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  19  4.95   317/1387  4.95  4.62  4.73  4.71  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  1  1  17  4.65   444/1386  4.65  4.35  4.32  4.24  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1  0  0  1  2  16  4.79   299/1380  4.79  4.43  4.32  4.30  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3  0  1  1  2  12  4.56   249/1193  4.56  4.24  4.02  4.04  4.56


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  2  1   8  4.55   355/1172  4.55  4.27  4.15  4.12  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  1  0  1  3   6  4.18   774/1182  4.18  4.39  4.35  4.30  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  3  2   6  4.27   751/1170  4.27  4.32  4.38  4.32  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   4  0  0  1  0   6  4.71   114/ 800  4.71  3.91  4.06  4.01  4.71


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A    3       Required for Majors  12      Graduate     0       Major         4
28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0       B   10
56-83     4       2.00-2.99    3       C    4       General               0      Under-grad  20       Non-major    16
84-150    1       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    1       F    0       Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 3
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HAPP 354  01                  University of Maryland                              Page  821
Title          Soc Bases:Publ/Comm Hl         Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Kalfoglou,Andre                Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       47
Questionnaires:   32                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions                 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   0  0  2  5 23  4.70  375/1447  4.70  4.40  4.31  4.32  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  0  0  8 23  4.74  260/1447  4.74  4.30  4.27  4.23  4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   0  0  1  5 24  4.77  272/1241  4.77  4.44  4.33  4.33  4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0  1  3  6 21  4.52  482/1402  4.52  4.24  4.24  4.24  4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   1  0  3  4 22  4.53  325/1358  4.53  4.13  4.11  4.10  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  2  9 18  4.55  342/1316  4.55  4.27  4.14  4.13  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0  0  0  4 27  4.87  106/1427  4.87  4.35  4.19  4.15  4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  0  5 26  4.84  673/1447  4.84  4.84  4.69  4.65  4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2  2  0  1  9 12  4.21  691/1434  4.21  4.02  4.10  4.09  4.21


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0  0  3  5 22  4.63  611/1387  4.63  4.44  4.46  4.44  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  0  1 30  4.97  211/1387  4.97  4.62  4.73  4.71  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0  0  0  7 23  4.77  303/1386  4.77  4.35  4.32  4.30  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0  0  1  2 27  4.87  204/1380  4.87  4.43  4.32  4.32  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0  0  0  1  3 25  4.83   93/1193  4.83  4.24  4.02  4.05  4.83


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  218/1172  4.75  4.27  4.15  4.24  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0  0  1  0 15  4.88  229/1182  4.88  4.39  4.35  4.42  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1  0  0  0 15  4.75  390/1170  4.75  4.32  4.38  4.49  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  16   1   0  1  1  3 10  4.47  217/ 800  4.47  3.91  4.06  4.12  4.47


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.20  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    31   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                31   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.38  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       31   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   31   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.50  ****
```

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 26 | Required for Majors | 20 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

|                                                      |    |    | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| Questions                                            | 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 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 4.86 | 190/1447 | 4.86 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.43 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.73 | 281/1447 | 4.73 | 4.30 | 4.27 | 4.31 | 4.73 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 4.91 | 141/1241 | 4.91 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 4.45 | 555/1402 | 4.45 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.24 | 626/1358 | 4.24 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.24 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.78 | 150/1316 | 4.78 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.27 | 4.78 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained          | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 4.50 | 459/1427 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 4.90 | 485/1447 | 4.90 | 4.84 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4.36 | 516/1434 | 4.36 | 4.02 | 4.10 | 4.17 | 4.36 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.70 | 521/1387 | 4.70 | 4.44 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 4.95 | 264/1387 | 4.95 | 4.62 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 4.67 | 431/1386 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.85 | 216/1380 | 4.85 | 4.43 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 4.68 | 174/1193 | 4.68 | 4.24 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 4.68 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4.75 | 218/1172 | 4.75 | 4.27 | 4.15 | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 271/1182 | 4.83 | 4.39 | 4.35 | 4.49 | 4.83 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 200/1170 | 4.92 | 4.32 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.92 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 195/ 800 | 4.50 | 3.91 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.50 |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 189 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.74 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 192 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 186 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.72 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 187 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 168 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.53 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/  66 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.87 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/  62 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.80 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/  58 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/  65 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear              | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/  64 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.43 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/  38 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/  36 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation     | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/  28 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.72 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/  30 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/  27 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.62 | **** |
| **Self  Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/  31 | **** | **** | 4.72 | 4.80 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/  21 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful    | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/  31 | **** | **** | 4.64 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful     | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/  20 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/  15 | **** | **** | 4.61 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                    Questions                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   5   2   6   8   1  2.91 1426/1447  2.91  4.40  4.31  4.43  2.91
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   6   7   5   3   0  2.24 1441/1447  2.24  4.30  4.27  4.31  2.24
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   0   2   5   6   5   2  3.00 1215/1241  3.00  4.44  4.33  4.41  3.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   0   2   5   7   4   3  3.05 1357/1402  3.05  4.24  4.24  4.34  3.05
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  1   4   7   1   6   2  2.75 1330/1358  2.75  4.13  4.11  4.15  2.75
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   6   2   5   6   3  2.91 1269/1316  2.91  4.27  4.14  4.27  2.91
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   8   4   4   4   2  2.45 1400/1427  2.45  4.35  4.19  4.20  2.45
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0   5  16  4.76  819/1447  4.76  4.84  4.69  4.72  4.76
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1  2   3   7   3   0  2.73 1390/1434  2.73  4.02  4.10  4.17  2.73


                    Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   3   3   5   7   2  3.10 1345/1387  3.10  4.44  4.46  4.48  3.10
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   2   3   7   6   3  3.24 1376/1387  3.24  4.62  4.73  4.76  3.24
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   6   4   8   2   1  2.43 1371/1386  2.43  4.35  4.32  4.34  2.43
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   1   4   5   6   2   3  2.75 1340/1380  2.75  4.43  4.32  4.34  2.75
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1  6   5   3   4   1  2.42 1164/1193  2.42  4.24  4.02  4.00  2.42


                    Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  2   4   4   0   2  2.67 1150/1172  2.67  4.27  4.15  4.25  2.67
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  4   1   3   2   2  2.75 1158/1182  2.75  4.39  4.35  4.49  2.75
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  4   1   4   2   1  2.58 1160/1170  2.58  4.32  4.38  4.51  2.58
 4. Were special techniques successful                 12   4   4   2   1   0   1  2.00  795/ 800  2.00  3.91  4.06  4.19  2.00


                    Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.74  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0  0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.61  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.72  ****


                    Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.87  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.80  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  4.59  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.55  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  4.43  ****


                    Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.68  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  23   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  4.42  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation       23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.62  ****


                    Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  4.80  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  5.00  ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

```
Course-Section: HAPP 412  01                University of Maryland                              Page  824
Title         Res Methods In Health         Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Kalfoglou,Andre               Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      26
Questionnaires:  21                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
                Questions                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  5  6  9  4.10 1012/1447  4.10  4.40  4.31  4.43  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  1  3  6 10  4.10  999/1447  4.10  4.30  4.27  4.31  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  5  6  9  4.10  882/1241  4.10  4.44  4.33  4.41  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  2  7  9  4.00  976/1402  4.00  4.24  4.24  4.34  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  2  5  5  8  3.81  987/1358  3.81  4.13  4.11  4.15  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  3  4  4  9  3.95  861/1316  3.95  4.27  4.14  4.27  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  1  4  1  3 11  3.95 1024/1427  3.95  4.35  4.19  4.20  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  1  1  1 17  4.70  928/1447  4.70  4.84  4.69  4.72  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3  1  1  1  2  6  7  4.00  849/1434  4.00  4.02  4.10  4.17  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  1  1  3  8  7  3.95 1202/1387  3.95  4.44  4.46  4.48  3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  2  5 13  4.55 1099/1387  4.55  4.62  4.73  4.76  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  1  0  4  6  9  4.10 1006/1386  4.10  4.35  4.32  4.34  4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  2  3  6  9  4.10  997/1380  4.10  4.43  4.32  4.34  4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  1  0  1  2  7  9  4.26  470/1193  4.26  4.24  4.02  4.00  4.26


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  10  0  1  0  2  2  6  4.09  675/1172  4.09  4.27  4.15  4.25  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10  0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36  668/1182  4.36  4.39  4.35  4.49  4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  10  0  1  0  1  2  7  4.27  751/1170  4.27  4.32  4.38  4.51  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   3  1  1  0  3  3  3.75  581/ 800  3.75  3.91  4.06  4.19  3.75
```

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

```
Course-Section: HAPP 452  01                  University of Maryland                                Page  825
Title          Health Care Org/Del            Baltimore County                                     JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Stuart,Mary E                  Spring 2010                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    47
Questionnaires: 19                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              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  0  1  1  4 12  4.50  585/1447  4.50  4.40  4.31 4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  3 11  4.39  702/1447  4.39  4.30  4.27 4.31  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  3  3 12  4.50  541/1241  4.50  4.44  4.33 4.41  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1  0  1  1  4 10  4.44  579/1402  4.44  4.24  4.24 4.34  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  2  4 11  4.39  474/1358  4.39  4.13  4.11 4.15  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 0 3 6  5  4.14  719/1316  4.14  4.27  4.14 4.27  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  7 10  4.50  459/1427  4.50  4.35  4.19 4.20  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  538/1447  4.89  4.84  4.69 4.72  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 1 6  5  4.08  812/1434  4.08  4.02  4.10 4.17  4.08


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  3 13  4.71  506/1387  4.71  4.44  4.46 4.48  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  1 15  4.82  732/1387  4.82  4.62  4.73 4.76  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  3 12  4.69  405/1386  4.69  4.35  4.32 4.34  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  0  4 11  4.35  799/1380  4.35  4.43  4.32 4.34  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 1 1 3 11  4.50  288/1193  4.50  4.24  4.02 4.00  4.50


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 1  7  4.50  377/1172  4.50  4.27  4.15 4.25  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1  9  4.90  198/1182  4.90  4.39  4.35 4.49  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 2  7  4.60  522/1170  4.60  4.32  4.38 4.51  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   0  0  0  2  1  7  4.50  195/ 800  4.50  3.91  4.06 4.19  4.50


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0          A   8      Required for Majors  13    Graduate    0       Major       14
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0          B   7
56-83      4       2.00-2.99    3          C   0      General               0    Under-grad  19      Non-major    5
84-150     3       3.00-3.49    5          D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3          F   0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I   0      Other                 0
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HAPP 498  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  826
Title       Fin Mgmt/Dec Sup HSO                 Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Coakley,Paul                          Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires:  34                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 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  0  5  26  4.84  222/1447  4.84  4.40  4.31  4.43  4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      3   0  0  0  0  2  29  4.94   78/1447  4.94  4.30  4.27  4.31  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     3   0  0  0  0  1  30  4.97   57/1241  4.97  4.44  4.33  4.41  4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      4   1  0  0  0  3  26  4.90  100/1402  4.90  4.24  4.24  4.34  4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  3   0  0  0  2  5  24  4.71  209/1358  4.71  4.13  4.11  4.15  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  7  24  4.77  150/1316  4.77  4.27  4.14  4.27  4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              3   0  0  0  0  3  28  4.90   86/1427  4.90  4.35  4.19  4.20  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                    3   0  0  0  0  2  29  4.94  339/1447  4.94  4.84  4.69  4.72  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  0  0  0  9  17  4.65  238/1434  4.65  4.02  4.10  4.17  4.65


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          4   0  0  0  0  2  28  4.93  140/1387  4.93  4.44  4.46  4.48  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     4   0  0  0  0  2  28  4.93  369/1387  4.93  4.62  4.73  4.76  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4   0  0  0  0  3  27  4.90  136/1386  4.90  4.35  4.32  4.34  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4   0  0  0  0  2  28  4.93  111/1380  4.93  4.43  4.32  4.34  4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7   9  1  1  2  2  12  4.28  463/1193  4.28  4.24  4.02  4.00  4.28


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14   0  0  0  2  3  15  4.65  289/1172  4.65  4.27  4.15  4.25  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14   0  0  0  2  1  17  4.75  347/1182  4.75  4.39  4.35  4.49  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14  0  0  0  0  1  19  4.95  134/1170  4.95  4.32  4.38  4.51  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   14   4  3  0  2  1  10  3.94  485/ 800  3.94  3.91  4.06  4.19  3.94

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2      0.00-0.99    0       A   19       Required for Majors  19   Graduate      0     Major        9
28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    4
56-83     1      2.00-2.99    1       C    0       General               0   Under-grad   34     Non-major   25
84-150    7      3.00-3.49    7       D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0       Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                 0
                                      ?    0
```