Course-Section: EHS 200 0101

Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER

Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J

Enrollment: 55
Questionnaires: 39

55

Spring 2007

Page 604 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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	2	0	4	13	20	4.26	899/1522	4.26	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	28	4.54	511/1522	4.54	4.31	4.26	4.29	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	28	4.46	578/1285	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.36	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	3	9	21	4.28	769/1476	4.28	4.08	4.22	4.20	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	0	5	6	19	4.06	728/1412	4.06	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	2	9	4	17	3.86	977/1381	3.86	4.00	4.08	3.97	3.86
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	232/1500	4.74	4.32	4.18	4.20	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	16		1144/1517	4.42	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	8	21	6	3.89	1049/1497	3.89	4.01	4.11	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	31	4.76	452/1440	4.76	4.57	4.45	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	32	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.77	4.71	4.78	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	27	4.59	490/1436	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	3	6	25	4.35	802/1432	4.35	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	4	3	25	4.31	430/1221	4.31	4.33	3.93	4.02	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	1	5	3	7	3.53	1022/1280	3.53	4.19	4.10	4.08	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	3	2	3	9	3.74	1072/1277	3.74	4.48	4.34	4.33	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	3	4	3	8	3.74	1041/1269	3.74	4.38	4.31	4.33	3.74
4. Were special techniques successful	20	10	4	0	2	1	2	2.67	****/ 854	****	4.45	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	***	4.00	4.35	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.83	4.58	4.58	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.60	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	4.59	4.41	4.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 45	****	4.09	4.30	4.58	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.75	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	***	4.09	4.31	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	 Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	39	Non-major	30
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F P	0 1	Electives	3	#### - Means responses to		are not enough gnificant	n

I 0 Other 21 ? 3

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101

Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI

Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 605 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer			-		ructor	Course	_		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	2	9	4.82	239/1522	4.82	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	193/1522		4.31	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1285		4.25	4.30	4.30	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	671/1476	4.36	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	185/1412	4.73	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	693/1381	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	242/1500	4.73	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	901/1517	4.70	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440		4.57	4.45	4.46	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436		4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.91	161/1432		4.22	4.29	4.29	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	442/1221	4.29	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.83	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.83
T alkania kanna														
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****
z. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 220		1.00	1.55	7.20	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	39/ 47	3.80	4.59	4.41	4.56	3.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.09	4.30	4.39	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	4	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.26	4.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribı	ıtior	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				2	2						

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101

SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT

Title DEAN, STEPHEN F

Instructor: Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2007

Page 606 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Questions					Fr 1	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran	_	Course Mean	e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	814/1	522	4.33	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.33
		ctor make clear th		1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	407/1		4.63	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.63
		uestions reflect t		0	8	0	0	0	1	0		****/1		****	4.25	4.30	4.30	****
	_	uations reflect th		0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	473/1		4.50	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.50
			to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0		****/1		****	4.00	4.06	4.03	****
			te to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	392/1		4.44	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.44
		g system clearly e	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1		4.89	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.89
	-	was class cancell	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1		4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.89
			teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	3		534/1		4.38		4.11		4.38
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1	440	4.88	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.88
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	859/1	448	4.75	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.75
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented a	nd explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	514/1	436	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.57
		es contribute to w		2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1	432	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.57
			ce your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	7			221	5.00	4.33		3.94	5.00
		Discussio																
			to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1		4.50	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.50
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively encou	raged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1	.277	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.50
		_	r and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1		4.50	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.50
4. Were s	special to	ul	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	854	****	4.45	4.02	4.00	****	
O Massa	Laboratory . Were you provided with adequate background informat					1	0	0	0	1	2 00	****/	220	****	4 00	4 25	4 20	++++
2. were y	ou provi	_	background information	7	0	Τ	U	U	U	Τ	3.00	***/	228		4.00	4.35	4.29	
1 Wassa		Seminar	the amounted them.	2	1	0	0	0	1	_	4 02	20/	70	4 02	4 02	4 50	4 52	4.83
	_	_	the announced theme	2	6	0	0	0	0	5 1	4.83	38/ ****/	79 77	4.83	4.83	4.58 4.52	4.53	****
			individual attention	2	2	•	-	-	-	_								
_		ons contribute to	-			0	0	1	0	4	4.60	46/	78	4.60	4.60	4.45	4.34	4.60
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made c	lear	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/	80	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.33	5.00
		Field Wor								_								
	_		to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	47	****	4.59	4.41	4.56	****
_			evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	45	****	4.09	4.30	4.39	****
		ctor available for		8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	39	****	3.53	4.40	4.68	****
4. To wha	ıt degree	could you discuss	your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.09	4.31	4.26	****
1 54	16	Self Pac		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/	27	****	****	4 63	г оо	****
I. Dia se	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/	37	* * * * *	* * * *	4.63	5.00	
							outio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	.
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0			Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Grad	luate	9	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	= *													_		_
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					Ge	nera	ı⊥				2	Unde	er-gi	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150 Grad.	1 0	3.00-3.49 2 3.50-4.00 0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	####	: - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ιh
	P 0							resp	onse	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	ıt					
			I 0	Other				3										
			2 0															

Baltimore County

Course-Section: EHS 311 0101

12

STRESS/BURNOUT EMER PE

MITCHELL, JEFFR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Page 607 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	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	4	6	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	702/1522	4.40	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.25	4.20	4.25	5.00
-	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.67
	0	1	0	2	0	3	4	4.07	760/1412	4.67	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3 4	4 5		434/1381		4.00			4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	387/1500	4.40 4.60	4.00	4.08 4.18	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	-	-	-	Τ	2	10							
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ	U	U	0	0	5	4	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	Ο	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.89	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	175/1221	4.67	4.33	3.93	3.94	
5. Did addiovisual techniques emance your understanding		U	U	U	U	3	0	4.07	1/3/1221	4.07	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.00
1									.,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.71	4.36	4.21	****
Freq	lency	Dis	trib	ation	ı									

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

? 0

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101

Title MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC

Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR

Enrollment:

16 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 608 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	•	0	•	0	•	1.4	F 00	1 /1 500	F 00	4 00	4 20	4 24	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1522		4.20	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	465/1522		4.31	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.64	386/1285	4.64	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	13	4.93	100/1476	4.93	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	411/1412		4.00	4.06	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	556/1381	4.31	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	275/1500		4.32	4.18	4.13	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	Τ	10	4.91	104/1497	4.91	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	394/1432		4.22	4.29	4.29	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	187/1221			3.93	3.94	
5. 21d dadiovipadi ocomingdos emidnos jour andersounding	ŭ	Ü	Ū	ŭ	ŭ		_	1.01	10,,1221	1.01	1.55	3.75	3.71	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.56	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	16/ 45		4.09	4.30	4.39	4.71
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	3.53	4.40	4.68	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.09	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	21/ 34	4.25	3.76	4.30	4.12	4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: EHS 350 0101 University of Maryland Title SUPERVISION: EHS SYSTEM Baltimore County Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 609
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	12				
Questionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean		
		General																
		w insights,skil			2	0	0	0	0	3	2		733/1522		4.20	4.30	4.34	
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.50
	_	estions reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.33
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	860/1476		4.08	4.22	4.26	4.20
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	760/1412		4.00	4.06	4.03	4.00
		_		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	693/1381	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.17
		system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	483/1500		4.32	4.18	4.13	4.50
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	.l tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.17
1 77		Lecture			1	0	0	0	1	2	_	4 1 7	1110/1440	4 1 7	4 57	4 45	1 10	4 1 17
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	Ţ	3			1112/1440		4.57		4.46	4.17
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0 1	3 3	3		1157/1448		4.77	4.71	4.71	4.50 4.17
	 Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 						0	0	U T	5	2 1		,		4.29 4.22	4.29 4.29	4.30	4.17
				you rearned your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	_	4.17			4.22			4.17
5. Did at	lalovisual	. tecnniques enn	lance y	our understanding	Τ	U	U	U	Τ	3	2	4.1/	524/1221	4.1/	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.1/
		Discuss	i on															
1. Did cl	lass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.00
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1277		4.48	4.34	4.38	4.33
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.00
		chniques succes			4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	426/ 854		4.45	4.02	4.00	4.00
	-	-																
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors					 }	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	6	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	Required for Majors 0					-	or addac	-	-		_	ŭ		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General (0	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	major	1			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General					-	5				3	_		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_j h	
																		•

Other

Course-Section: EHS 351 0101 University of Maryland Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:E

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F

Enrollment: 16 Ouestionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 610

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

6 4.44 442/1280 4.44 4.19 4.10 4.14 4.44

560/1277 4.56 4.48 4.34 4.38 4.56

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.43 707/1522 4.43 4.20 4.30 4.34 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 383/1522 4.64 4.31 4.26 4.25 4.64 337/1285 4.69 4.25 4.30 4.30 4.69 444/1476 4.54 4.08 4.22 4.26 4.54 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 3 3 7 4.07 715/1412 4.07 4.00 4.06 4.03 4.07 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 331/1381 4.50 4.00 4.08 4.13 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 415/1500 4.57 4.32 4.18 4.13 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 389/1517 4.93 4.73 4.65 4.62 4.93 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 189/1497 4.75 4.01 4.11 4.13 4.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 0 4 10 4.71 532/1440 4.71 4.57 4.45 4.46 4.71 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 629/1448 4.86 4.77 4.71 4.71 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 357/1436 4.71 4.29 4.29 4.30 4.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 478/1432 4.64 4.22 4.29 4.29 4.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 3 2 8 4.38 373/1221 4.38 4.33 3.93 3.94 4.38 Discussion

6 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 586/1269 4.50 4.38 4.31 4.39 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 6 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 157/ 854 4.63 4.45 4.02 4.00 4.63

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	-					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			

Frequency Distribution

0 0 1

2 1

2

6 4.56

5 0 0 0

5 0 Course-Section: EHS 360 0101

Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS

Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 611 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.25	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	680/1412	4.13	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.22	4.29		4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	144/1221	4.71	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.71
Discussion		_			_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.17	644/1280	4.17	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.38	4.31		4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	U	0	3	4	4.57	174/ 854	4.57	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.71	4.36	4.21	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	3.86	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	3.57		4.35	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	4.26	****
Seminar	_	_					_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.83	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7 7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	4.60 5.00	4.45 4.11	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	/	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 80		5.00	4.11	3.33	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.59	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.09	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.09	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.76	4.30	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101

Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS

Instructor:

INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EH MITCHELL, JEFFR

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 611 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 400 0101 University of Maryland Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE Baltimore County Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 612
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course	Evaluation (Questionnaire

?

0

	Questions						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.20	4.30	4.42	4.75
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.88	4.31	4.26	4.34	4.88
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.75
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.08	4.22	4.31	4.63
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	457/1412	4.38	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.38
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1381	4.86	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.86
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.75
	-	was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.67
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.57	4.45	4.52	4.71
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.88
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	1	1	6	4.63	457/1436	4.63	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.63
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.63
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	343/1221	4.43	4.33	3.93	4.04	4.43
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	4.67
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.83
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	4.67
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.45	4.02	4.31	4.80
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
				·														
	00-27						quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55								,				0	1	, ,	0			0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0 F 0		Flogtimes						0			1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	- 0		Electives						0	#### - 1				_][]
						0-1	h					_	respons	es to f	e sign	ıııcan	l L	
				I 0		Ot.	her					6						

Course-Section: EHS 476 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Title INTRO TRAUMA EMERGENCI Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 613 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 10 Student	Course	Evai														
			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	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	1	0	_	3	1	2 20	1456/1522	2 20	4 20	4 20	4.42	2 20		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5 5	<i>3</i>	1		1323/1522		4.20	4.26	4.42	3.60		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	1			1231/1285			4.30	4.42			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	U	3	2			1446/1476		4.08	4.22	4.31			
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		1	2	1	1	2			1296/1412		4.00	4.06	4.11			
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		4	0	1	2	2			1152/1381				4.21			
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3				1219/1500				4.25			
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10			1389/1517							
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened		0	0	3	5	2			1438/1497							
y. now would jou grade one overall oddoning errootiven	000	Ü	·			-	ŭ	2.,,	1130,113,	3.33	1.01			5.55		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	3	1	3.10	1402/1440	3.80	4.57	4.45	4.52	3.80		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5			1407/1448		4.77		4.75	4.10		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	y 0	0	1		5				1373/1436		4.29	4.29	4.32	3.55		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3			0	3.10	1355/1432	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.34	3.67		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ng 0	1	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	933/1221	3.89	4.33	3.93	4.04	3.89		
•	_															
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	d 4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	3.67		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	e 4	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.48	4.34	4.50	3.50		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	on 4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	3.67		
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	569/ 854	3.80	4.45	4.02	4.31	3.80		
Laboratory																
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1				190/ 215							
2. Were you provided with adequate background informat			0	0					178/ 228				4.32			
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	es 3	-	0						205/ 217				4.55			
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	4	-	3.57	,							
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	185/ 205	3.50	3.50	4.23	3.85	3.50		
F	requency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	des			R≏	ason	g			Ty	ne			Majors			
Expected Glai										-						

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: EHS 476 0101 Title

University of Maryland INTRO TRAUMA EMERGENCI Baltimore County POLK, DWIGHT A (Instr. B) Spring 2007

Instructor: Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 614 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
. Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	his course	0	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1456/1522	3.30	4.20	4.30	4.42	3.30
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.60
		estions reflec			1	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1231/1285	3.22	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.22
. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the expec	ted goals	0	1	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1446/1476	2.78	4.08	4.22	4.31	2.78
. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to wha	t you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1296/1412	3.22	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.22
. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute to w	hat you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.50
		g system clearly		d	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1219/1500	3.70	4.32	4.18	4.25	3.70
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.00
. How woul	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teachin	g effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	718/1497	3.55	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.55
		Lectur	e															
. Were the	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well pre	pared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	3.80	4.57	4.45	4.52	3.80
. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in t	he subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1448	4.10	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.10
. Was lect	ture mat	terial presente	d and expl	ained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	3.55	4.29	4.29	4.32	3.55
. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what vou	learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.34	3.67
		l techniques en	_		6	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	408/1221	3.89	4.33	3.93	4.04	3.89
		Discus	sion															
. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to wha	t you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	3.67
. Were al	.l studer	nts actively en	couraged t	o participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.48	4.34	4.50	3.50
. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and o	pen discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	3.67
. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	569/ 854	3.80	4.45	4.02	4.31	3.80
		Labora	tory															
. Did the	lab ind	crease understa	nding of t	he material	3	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	190/ 215	3.71	3.71	4.36	4.47	3.71
. Were you	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backgro	und information	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.00
. Were ned	ecessary	materials avai	lable for	lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	205/ 217	3.86	3.86	4.51	4.55	3.86
. Did the	lab ins	structor provid	e assistan	ce	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	193/ 216	3.57	3.57	4.42	4.20	3.57
. Were red	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts clear	ly specified	3	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	185/ 205	3.50	3.50	4.23	3.85	3.50
				Frequ	uency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea:	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
										0			n	 Мо		10		
	0		· ·	**		кес	quir	eu I	OT Mg	ajors	5	U	Graduat	=	U	Ma JC)T	ΤÜ
						Co	ners	1				Λ	IInder-	rad 1	0	Non	-maior	0
						Gel	ııcı a	_				J	onder-9	rau 1	. 0	11011-	ilia JUI	U
							ecti.	Wes				0	#### - 1	Means +	here =	re not	enouc	h
, L uu .	U	3.30 1.00	<u> </u>	- *		11.1	CCCI	v C D									_	**
				= *		Other				1	0	1 00 20110		.c bigi				
				? 0		001					_	. •						
R. Were necessary materials available for lab acts. Did the lab instructor provide assistance. B. Were requirements for lab reports clearly spectors. Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expectors. Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expectors. Concern 0 0.00-0.99 0 A Expectors. Concern 0 1.00-1.99 0 B S6-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C S84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D Grad. Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F				Frequence Freque		P Dist	trib quir nera ecti	Rea ed fo	n ason:	s 	 S	0 0 0		pe e rad 1 Means t	0 0 .0	Majo Non are no	- -	Majors or -major t enoug

Course-Section: EHS 477 0101 University of Maryla
Title SPECIAL POPULATIONS Baltimore County
Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A Spring 2007

Ρ

I

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

10

University of Maryland Page 615
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluatio	on Questio	nnaire
---------	--------	-----------	------------	--------

						Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
			Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 															
1. D	Did vou	gain ne	w insights,skil		om this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.20	4.30	4.42	4.45
			tor make clear			1		0	1	0	3	7	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.34	4.45
			estions reflect			1	0	1	1	2	3	4		1101/1285	3.73	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.73
			ations reflect			1	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.08	4.22	4.31	4.20
					what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	973/1412	3.80	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.80
6. D	Did wri	tten ass	ignments contri	bute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	938/1381	3.91	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.91
7. W	Was the	grading	system clearly	expla	ained	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	444/1500	4.55	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.55
8. H	How man	y times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1307/1517	4.18	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.18
9. H	How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	ll tead	ching effectivenes	s 1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	544/1497	4.36	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.36
			Lecture	2															
1. W	Were th	e instru	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1440	4.64	4.57	4.45	4.52	4.64		
				1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.82	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.82		
3. W	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	762/1436	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.36
4. D	Did the	lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	695/1432	4.45	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.45
5. D	Did aud	liovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	500/1221	4.20	4.33	3.93	4.04	4.20
			Discuss	sion															
1. D	Did cla	ss discu			what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.19	4.10	4.28	4.57
					ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.71
					nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.49	4.57
			chniques succes		-	5	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.83	4.45	4.02	4.31	4.83
					Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Q	32 to 11 to 12 to		The state of Contract				D -									M			
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	asons	3 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	11
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-		0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	1
	-150	D 0																	
Gra	ad.	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh			

Other

10

Course-Section: EHS 481 0101

Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I

Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 616 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	1	1	0	3	_	4 00	1100/1500	4 00	4 00	4 20	4 40	4 00
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	1	1	1	3 4	3		1122/1522 1290/1522	4.00 3.70	4.20 4.31	4.30 4.26	4.42	4.00 3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2		****/1285	3.7U ****	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.70 ****
-		2	1	0	1	4	2							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	0		1198/1476 ****/1412	3.75 ****	4.08	4.22	4.31	3.75 ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	4	0		1286/1381		4.00	4.08	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	1	2		1422/1500	3.00 3.10	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.32	4.18	4.25	5.00
<u>.</u>	1	0	0	2	5	2	10		, -					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	2	5	2	U	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3 60	1345/1440	3.60	4.57	4.45	4.52	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	1		1197/1436		4.29	4.29	4.32	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	3	0		1344/1432	3.20	4.22	4.29	4.34	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/1221	****	4.33	3.93		****
5. Did additivibual teelmiques cimanee your understanding	5	1	O	O	O	_	O	1.00	/ 1221		1.55	3.75	1.01	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.45	4.02	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.71	4.36	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 217	****	3.86	4.51	4.55	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 216		3.57	4.42	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	3.85	****
-1 11 ··· 1														
Field Work	0		-	0	-	-	_	4 10	22/ 45	4 10	4 50	4 41	4 51	4 10
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5 1	4.13	33/ 47	4.13	4.59	4.41	4.51	4.13
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	2	2	1	2	_	2.75	44/ 45	2.75	4.09	4.30	4.22	2.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	2 1	2	1	3	3.63	33/ 39	3.63	3.53	4.40	4.03	3.63
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0 1	0	_	2	2	3	3.88	28/ 35		4.09		4.13	3.88
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	Τ	Τ	0	3	2	1	3.29	31/ 34	3.29	3.76	4.30	4.11	3.29
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EHS 483 0101 University of Maryland ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 617

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 814/1522 4.33 4.20 4.30 4.42 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 545/1522 4.50 4.31 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1285 5.00 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 703/1476 4.33 4.08 4.31 4.26 4.34 4.50 1/1285 5.00 4.25 4.30 4.42 5.00 4.22 4.31 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00760/1412 4.00 4.00 4.06 4.11 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 519/1381 4.33 4.00 4.08 4.21 4.337. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.32 4.18 4.25 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.73 4.65 4.71 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1204/1497 3.67 4.01 4.11 4.21 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 Ω 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.57 4.45 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 5.00 3 0 0 0 0 0 1/1448 5.00 4.77 4.71 4.75 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.29 4.29 4.32 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 1036/1432 4.00 4.22 4.29 4.34 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 606/1221 4.00 4.33 3.93 4.04 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.19 4.10 4.28 4.00 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.48 4.34 4.50 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.38 4.31 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/854 5.00 4.45 4.02 4.31 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 47 5.00 4.59 4.41 4.51 5.00 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 45 5.00 4.09 4.30 4.22 5.00 3 0 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 1 0 0 3.00 35/ 39 3.00 3.53 4.40 4.03 3.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 3 0 0 1/ 35 5.00 4.09 4.31 4.13 5.00 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 0 1 0 4.00 22/ 34 4.00 3.76 4.30 4.11 4.00 3 0 0 Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 492 0101 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I

COONEY, MICHAEL

Instructor: Enrollment:

9 Questionnaires: 3 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 618 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			3		Instructor		Course Dept				
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	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1505/1522	2.67	4.20	4.30	4.42	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1419/1522	3.33	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1248/1285	3.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1456/1476	2.67	4.08	4.22	4.31	2.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1350/1381	2.50	4.00	4.08	4.21	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.32	4.18	4.25	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.57	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	0		1419/1436	2.50	4.29	4.29	4.32	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	0		1402/1432	2.50	4.22	4.29	4.34	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.33	3.93	4.04	
Discussion														
	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	710/1000	4 00	4 10	4 10	4 20	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	4.00	718/1280 1/1277	4.00 5.00	4.19 4.48	4.10 4.34	4.28 4.50	4.00 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/12/7	5.00	4.40	4.34	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.36	4.02	4.49	
4. Were special techniques successful	۷	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	1/ 054	5.00	4.45	4.02	4.31	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	40/ 45	3.00	4.09	4.30	4.22	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	39/ 39	2.50	3.53	4.40	4.03	2.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	30/ 35	3.50	4.09	4.31	4.13	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	27/ 34	3.50	3.76	4.30	4.11	3.50

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