

Course Section: EHS 100 0101
 Title FRESHMAN EXPERIENCE EH
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 634
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	957/1666	4.20	3.97	4.19	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.23	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	3.99	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.97	4.06	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1647	4.80	3.86	4.12	4.06	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1648/1668	3.25	4.54	4.67	4.62	3.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.03	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.43	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	3.97	4.24	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.89	4.26	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.00	3.89	3.85	3.68	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.93	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.18	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.17	4.00	3.81	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: EHS 200 0101
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 635
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	5	12	17	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.14	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	9	19	4.22	922/1666	4.22	3.97	4.19	4.29	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	2	5	24	4.31	764/1421	4.31	4.23	4.24	4.35	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	5	10	15	4.23	831/1617	4.23	3.99	4.15	4.24	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	3	0	1	7	17	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	1	4	10	13	3.94	981/1543	3.94	3.97	4.06	4.10	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	4	5	21	4.38	697/1647	4.38	3.86	4.12	4.19	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	3	20	7	4.06	1498/1668	4.06	4.54	4.67	4.59	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	14	7	4.04	897/1605	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	0	4	25	4.68	569/1514	4.68	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	2	29	4.71	973/1551	4.71	4.43	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	4	6	20	4.31	823/1503	4.31	3.97	4.24	4.29	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	4	8	18	4.25	909/1506	4.25	3.89	4.26	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	3	4	22	4.53	250/1311	4.53	3.89	3.85	3.96	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	7	4	7	3.75	1036/1490	3.75	3.93	4.05	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	2	5	10	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	2	1	4	11	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.10	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	2	1	6	3	6	3.56	744/1006	3.56	4.17	4.00	3.99	3.56	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.29	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	4.14	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 223	****	4.29	4.35	4.71	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.60	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	2.62	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.49	4.22	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	21

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: EHS 300 0101
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 636
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	3	5	7	4.13	1077/1669	4.13	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	801/1666	4.31	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	645/1421	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.71	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	0	5	2	2	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.25	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	651/1647	4.40	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1172/1605	3.80	4.00	4.07	4.09	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	1083/1551	4.63	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	670/1503	4.44	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	676/1311	3.93	3.89	3.85	3.97	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	808/1490	4.10	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	920/1502	4.20	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.36	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.29	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.14	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.29	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.75	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	2.92	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	2.62	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.49	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.76	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	2.78	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.38	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.83	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.70	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.50	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	2.50	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: EHS 300 0101
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 636
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: EHS 301 0101
 Title PLANNING EMER HLTH SYS
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 637
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	605/1666	4.47	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	465/1617	4.53	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	734/1555	4.07	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	232/1647	4.73	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.54	4.67	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	288/1605	4.62	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	491/1503	4.57	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	407/1506	4.71	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	319/1311	4.43	3.89	3.85	3.97	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	512/1490	4.44	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	453/1006	4.11	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	2.92	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	2.62	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 638
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	7	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	691/1666	4.40	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	970/1617	4.10	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.97	4.06	4.14	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	926/1647	4.20	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	932/1503	4.20	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	718/1506	4.44	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.89	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	585/1490	4.38	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	880/1502	4.25	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	999/1489	4.13	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	97/ 226	4.43	4.36	4.20	4.17	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	110/ 233	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.13	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	173/ 225	4.14	4.14	4.50	4.45	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	156/ 223	4.14	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.75	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	81/ 112	4.00	4.50	4.38	4.53	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	4.40	4.36	4.12	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.75	4.22	4.47	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	85/ 105	3.67	2.92	4.20	4.45	3.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	2.62	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	32/ 58	4.43	4.49	4.22	4.29	4.43	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	27/ 52	4.29	3.76	4.06	3.59	4.29	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	26/ 39	4.00	2.78	4.39	3.82	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	24/ 40	3.67	3.38	3.97	3.34	3.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	37/ 55	4.17	3.83	4.34	4.03	4.17	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	2	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	33/ 42	3.40	3.70	4.31	4.13	3.40	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	3.50	4.45	4.13	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	19/ 33	4.00	2.50	4.25	3.00	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	3	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	23/ 29	3.50	3.75	4.34	4.13	3.50	

Course Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 638
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	Graduate	2	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: EHS 310 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 639
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	5	3	4.38	769/1669	4.38	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1019/1666	4.13	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1617	4.50	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	****	3.96	4.00	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1543	4.25	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.54	4.67	4.68	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1605	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.89	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.89	3.85	3.97	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	764/1490	4.17	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.29	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.50	4.38	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 97	4.80	4.40	4.36	4.12	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.75	4.22	4.47	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	2.92	4.20	4.45	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	24/ 98	4.86	2.62	3.95	4.15	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EHS 320 0101
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 640
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	10	4.69	345/1669	4.69	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	814/1666	4.31	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	190/1421	4.85	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1617	4.77	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	1	0	5	3.27	1350/1555	3.27	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	362/1543	4.54	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	446/1647	4.54	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.54	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	99/1605	4.91	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.03	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.43	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	347/1503	4.69	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	433/1506	4.69	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	137/1311	4.77	3.89	3.85	3.97	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	422/1490	4.55	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	648/1489	4.55	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/1006	4.70	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.36	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.29	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.14	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.29	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.75	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	2.92	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	2.62	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.49	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.76	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	2.78	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.38	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.83	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.70	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.50	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	2.50	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: EHS 320 0101
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 640
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: EHS 345 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: CUMBERLAND, TRA
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 641
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	28	0	0	1	1	13	29	4.59	489/1669	4.59	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	28	0	1	0	7	14	22	4.27	854/1666	4.27	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	28	0	1	3	6	12	22	4.16	894/1421	4.16	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	28	0	1	2	4	16	21	4.23	831/1617	4.23	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	4	14	25	4.41	438/1555	4.41	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	28	1	3	1	8	6	25	4.14	795/1543	4.14	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	28	0	0	0	3	13	28	4.57	412/1647	4.57	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	29	0	0	0	1	5	37	4.84	844/1668	4.84	4.54	4.67	4.68	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	1	0	1	8	17	11	4.03	904/1605	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	2	9	31	4.69	537/1514	4.69	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	1	40	4.93	409/1551	4.93	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	2	14	25	4.56	500/1503	4.56	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	2	2	9	28	4.54	613/1506	4.54	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	1	1	0	5	9	25	4.43	319/1311	4.43	3.89	3.85	3.97	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	3	1	9	7	17	3.92	945/1490	3.92	3.93	4.05	4.11	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	1	0	5	12	19	4.30	852/1502	4.30	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	1	0	1	8	27	4.62	574/1489	4.62	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	35	25	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	****/1006	****	4.17	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.36	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.29	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.14	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.29	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.75	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	2.92	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	2.62	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.49	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.76	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	2.78	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.38	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.83	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.70	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.50	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	2.50	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: EHS 345 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: CUMBERLAND, TRA
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 641
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	14	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	20	Under-grad	72	Non-major	71
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course Section: EHS 345H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: CUMBERLAND, TRA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 642
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	3.97	4.19	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	492/1555	4.33	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.43	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	846/1311	3.67	3.89	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1223/1489	3.67	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	694/1006	3.67	4.17	4.00	4.10	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	4.49	4.22	4.29	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	3.76	4.06	3.59	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	39/ 39	2.00	2.78	4.39	3.82	2.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	40/ 40	2.00	3.38	3.97	3.34	2.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	43/ 55	3.50	3.83	4.34	4.03	3.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	27/ 42	4.00	3.70	4.31	4.13	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	45/ 46	3.00	3.50	4.45	4.13	3.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	33/ 33	1.00	2.50	4.25	3.00	1.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.13	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EHS 352 0101
 Title MICRO COMP APPS HLTH M
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 643
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	433/1669	4.64	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	103/1666	4.91	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.99	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	611/1555	4.20	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.78	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	241/1647	4.73	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.54	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	343/1605	4.55	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	189/1514	4.91	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	210/1503	4.82	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	164/1506	4.91	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	79/1311	4.90	3.89	3.85	3.97	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.80	

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 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 644
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.14	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1288/1666	3.83	3.97	4.19	4.20	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1166/1421	3.67	4.23	4.24	4.25	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1207/1617	3.83	3.99	4.15	4.22	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.97	4.06	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	3.86	4.12	4.14	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.54	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.00	4.07	4.09	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.43	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	3.97	4.24	4.28	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	980/1506	4.17	3.89	4.26	4.30	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	846/1311	3.67	3.89	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.93	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: EHS 430 0101
 Title RESEARCH TOPICS IN EHS
 Instructor: BISSELL, RICHA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 645
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	5	8	4.24	938/1669	4.24	4.14	4.23	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	752/1666	4.35	3.97	4.19	4.22	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.23	4.24	4.38	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	673/1617	4.38	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	687/1555	4.13	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	857/1543	4.06	3.97	4.06	4.18	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	634/1647	4.41	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	750/1668	4.88	4.54	4.67	4.70	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.00	4.07	4.16	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	845/1514	4.47	4.03	4.39	4.45	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	1055/1551	4.65	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	896/1503	4.24	3.97	4.24	4.27	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	876/1506	4.29	3.89	4.26	4.29	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	439/1311	4.27	3.89	3.85	3.88	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1490	4.42	3.93	4.05	4.26	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	360/1006	4.30	4.17	4.00	4.21	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 2		

Course Section: EHS 470 0101
 Title EMERG RESPONSE TO CRIS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 646
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	5	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.14	4.23	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	881/1666	4.25	3.97	4.19	4.22	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1100/1421	3.83	4.23	4.24	4.38	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1154/1617	3.92	3.99	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	939/1555	3.91	3.96	4.00	4.08	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1138/1543	3.75	3.97	4.06	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1002/1647	4.08	3.86	4.12	4.14	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.54	4.67	4.70	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	631/1605	4.30	4.00	4.07	4.16	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	939/1514	4.42	4.03	4.39	4.45	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	959/1503	4.17	3.97	4.24	4.27	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	980/1506	4.17	3.89	4.26	4.29	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	542/1311	4.09	3.89	3.85	3.88	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1022/1490	3.78	3.93	4.05	4.26	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1502	4.56	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	393/1006	4.22	4.17	4.00	4.21	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course Section: EHS 471 0101
 Title EMS SYSTEMS & ASSESSME
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 647
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.14	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	181/1666	4.80	3.97	4.19	4.22	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	773/1421	4.30	4.23	4.24	4.38	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1617	4.50	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.97	4.06	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.00	4.07	4.16	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.03	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.70	3.97	4.24	4.27	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.80	3.89	4.26	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	79/1311	4.90	3.89	3.85	3.88	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.93	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.17	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	123/ 226	4.29	4.36	4.20	4.61	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	110/ 233	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.40	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	173/ 225	4.14	4.14	4.50	4.39	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	126/ 223	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.56	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	155/ 206	3.75	3.75	4.15	4.20	3.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.49	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.76	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	2.78	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.38	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 1			

Course Section: EHS 472 0101
 Title PRIN OF PHARMACOLOGY
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 648
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	1	6	4.30	852/1669	4.30	4.14	4.23	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	0	3.10	1570/1666	3.10	3.97	4.19	4.22	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	7	0	3.30	1298/1421	3.30	4.23	4.24	4.38	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	0	2.80	1569/1617	2.80	3.99	4.15	4.22	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1045/1555	3.78	3.96	4.00	4.08	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	4	0	2.78	1485/1543	2.78	3.97	4.06	4.18	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1489/1647	3.30	3.86	4.12	4.14	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1607/1668	3.80	4.54	4.67	4.70	3.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	1493/1605	3.11	4.00	4.07	4.16	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	3	1	0	2.20	1498/1514	2.20	4.03	4.39	4.45	2.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1518/1551	3.20	4.43	4.66	4.73	3.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	2	3	0	2.70	1456/1503	2.70	3.97	4.24	4.27	2.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	4	0	2.70	1441/1506	2.70	3.89	4.26	4.29	2.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	3.89	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1288/1490	3.20	3.93	4.05	4.26	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1462/1489	2.60	4.10	4.29	4.52	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1006	****	4.17	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: EHS 482 0101
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I
 Instructor: KORGER-CULLUM S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 649
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	4	1	3	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.14	4.23	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	1594/1666	2.89	3.97	4.19	4.22	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1421	****	4.23	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1606/1617	2.25	3.99	4.15	4.22	2.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1555	****	3.96	4.00	4.08	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.97	4.06	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	1	1	0	0	1.33	1641/1647	1.33	3.86	4.12	4.14	1.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1240/1668	4.44	4.54	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	1533/1605	2.86	4.00	4.07	4.16	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1498/1514	2.20	4.03	4.39	4.45	2.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1501/1551	3.40	4.43	4.66	4.73	3.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	1	0	0	2.00	1492/1503	2.00	3.97	4.24	4.27	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	1499/1506	1.80	3.89	4.26	4.29	1.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1311	****	3.89	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1447/1490	2.40	3.93	4.05	4.26	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1439/1502	2.80	4.18	4.26	4.46	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1434/1489	2.80	4.10	4.29	4.52	2.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	4.49	4.22	3.94	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	46/ 52	2.50	3.76	4.06	3.80	2.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	38/ 39	2.33	2.78	4.39	3.78	2.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	39/ 40	2.25	3.38	3.97	3.81	2.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	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	9				
				?	1						

Course Section: EHS 491 0101
 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I
 Instructor: KORGER-CULLUM S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 650
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1626/1669	2.83	4.14	4.23	4.39	2.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1624/1666	2.67	3.97	4.19	4.22	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	3.99	4.15	4.22	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	****	3.96	4.00	4.08	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1543	****	3.97	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	1643/1647	1.17	3.86	4.12	4.14	1.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.54	4.67	4.70	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1549/1605	2.67	4.00	4.07	4.16	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1513/1514	1.67	4.03	4.39	4.45	1.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1509/1551	3.17	4.43	4.66	4.73	3.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1492/1503	2.50	3.97	4.24	4.27	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1502/1506	1.58	3.89	4.26	4.29	1.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	3.89	3.85	3.88	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1447/1490	2.40	3.93	4.05	4.26	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.21	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.69	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	103/ 105	1.50	2.92	4.20	4.27	1.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	95/ 98	1.50	2.62	3.95	3.86	1.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.49	4.22	3.94	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	3.76	4.06	3.80	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	2.78	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	15/ 40	4.50	3.38	3.97	3.81	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: EHS 491 0101
 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 651
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1626/1669	2.83	4.14	4.23	4.39	2.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1624/1666	2.67	3.97	4.19	4.22	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	3.99	4.15	4.22	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	****	3.96	4.00	4.08	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1543	****	3.97	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	1643/1647	1.17	3.86	4.12	4.14	1.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.54	4.67	4.70	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1605	2.67	4.00	4.07	4.16	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1501/1514	1.67	4.03	4.39	4.45	1.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1525/1551	3.17	4.43	4.66	4.73	3.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	2.50	3.97	4.24	4.27	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1506/1506	1.58	3.89	4.26	4.29	1.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	1.00	3.89	3.85	3.88	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1447/1490	2.40	3.93	4.05	4.26	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.21	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.50	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.40	4.36	4.69	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	103/ 105	1.50	2.92	4.20	4.27	1.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	95/ 98	1.50	2.62	3.95	3.86	1.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.49	4.22	3.94	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	3.76	4.06	3.80	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	2.78	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	15/ 40	4.50	3.38	3.97	3.81	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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