

Course-Section: EHS 100 0101
 Title FRESHMAN EXPERIENCE EH
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 630
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	5	4.27	870/1639	4.27	4.58	4.27	4.08	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	600/1639	4.45	4.56	4.22	4.17	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1397	****	4.54	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.45	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.25	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	770/1504	4.10	4.38	4.05	3.78	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	575/1612	4.44	4.61	4.16	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.74	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	134/1579	4.82	4.41	4.08	3.95	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.72	4.43	4.38	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.74	4.22	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.41	3.94	3.84	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.56	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.69	4.30	4.07	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.70	4.28	4.01	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	325/ 958	4.30	4.36	3.93	3.71	4.30	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	221/ 240	3.00	3.00	4.11	4.01	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	46/ 85	4.73	4.73	4.58	4.50	4.73	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	41/ 82	4.64	4.64	4.52	4.12	4.64	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	52/ 78	4.09	4.09	4.47	4.25	4.09	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	40/ 80	4.64	4.64	4.47	4.39	4.64	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	30/ 82	4.67	4.67	4.16	3.90	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.61	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	27/ 53	4.33	4.61	4.05	3.51	4.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	37/ 42	4.33	4.67	4.75	4.79	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.67	4.58	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	27/ 50	4.67	4.67	4.45	4.54	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	34/ 43	4.33	4.33	4.69	4.69	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EHS 100 0101
 Title FRESHMAN EXPERIENCE EH
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 630
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 8	A 0	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 10		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

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	7	30	4.81	248/1639	4.81	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	26	4.65	371/1639	4.65	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	29	4.73	313/1397	4.73	4.54	4.28	4.39	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	7	21	4.37	640/1583	4.37	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	243/1532	4.66	4.25	4.01	4.09	4.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	8	10	16	4.11	758/1504	4.11	4.38	4.05	4.09	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	25	4.62	364/1612	4.62	4.61	4.16	4.21	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	781/1635	4.83	4.74	4.65	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	0	5	22	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.41	4.08	4.14	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.72	4.43	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	164/1520	4.97	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.72	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.74	4.22	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	2	3	28	4.57	234/1295	4.57	4.41	3.94	4.07	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	4	18	4.41	511/1398	4.41	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	4	2	20	4.52	608/1391	4.52	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	3	23	4.74	399/1388	4.74	4.70	4.28	4.37	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	240/ 958	4.45	4.36	3.93	4.00	4.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.00	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.73	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.64	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	4.09	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 82	****	4.67	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.61	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 10	A 20	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	22	
?	0			

Course-Section: EHS 300 0101
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE
 Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 632
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	5	7	4.27	880/1639	4.27	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	273/1639	4.73	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.54	4.28	4.26	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1035/1532	3.77	4.25	4.01	4.05	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	208/1504	4.71	4.38	4.05	4.12	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.61	4.16	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.41	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	1069/1518	4.29	4.72	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	961/1520	4.71	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	428/1517	4.64	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	401/1550	4.71	4.74	4.22	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.41	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	908/1398	3.86	4.56	4.07	4.13	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	793/1391	4.29	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	815/1388	4.29	4.70	4.28	4.34	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 958	****	4.36	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.00	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.73	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.64	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.09	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.67	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.61	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.67	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.33	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EHS 300 0101
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE
 Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 632
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 633
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	9	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1639	4.44	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	822/1397	4.22	4.54	4.28	4.26	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1583	4.83	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.25	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.38	4.05	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.61	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	312/1579	4.57	4.41	4.08	4.07	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1118/1518	4.22	4.72	4.43	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	325/1550	4.78	4.74	4.22	4.20	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	783/1295	3.83	4.41	3.94	3.95	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.88	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	258/1391	4.88	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.70	4.28	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	411/ 958	4.14	4.36	3.93	3.97	4.14	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.78	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.61	4.05	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	22/ 37	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.52	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.67	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.33	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 320 0101
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 634
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1397	4.92	4.54	4.28	4.26	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	256/1532	4.64	4.25	4.01	4.05	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1504	4.92	4.38	4.05	4.12	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	352/1612	4.64	4.61	4.16	4.12	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.91	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.41	4.08	4.07	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.72	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.92	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.74	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1295	4.92	4.41	3.94	3.95	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.70	4.28	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	135/ 958	4.71	4.36	3.93	3.97	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.73	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.64	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.09	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.67	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.61	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.67	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.33	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EHS 320 0101
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 634
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 345 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: CUMBERLAND, TRA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 635
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	12	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	486/1639	4.53	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	897/1397	4.14	4.54	4.28	4.26	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	571/1532	4.27	4.25	4.01	4.05	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	529/1504	4.36	4.38	4.05	4.12	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.61	4.16	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.41	4.08	4.07	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	271/1518	4.87	4.72	4.43	4.39	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	648/1520	4.87	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	474/1517	4.60	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.74	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	119/1295	4.79	4.41	3.94	3.95	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	582/1398	4.31	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	462/1391	4.69	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.70	4.28	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	703/ 958	3.56	4.36	3.93	3.97	3.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 4	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 636
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	7	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.54	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	143/1583	4.90	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.25	4.01	4.05	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	441/1504	4.44	4.38	4.05	4.12	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	4.88	4.61	4.16	4.12	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.41	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.72	4.43	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1517	4.90	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	174/1550	4.90	4.74	4.22	4.20	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	124/1295	4.78	4.41	3.94	3.95	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.70	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.36	3.93	3.97	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.73	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.64	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.09	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.67	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.61	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.67	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.33	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 636
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 430 0101
 Title RESEARCH TOPICS IN EHS
 Instructor: BISSELL, RICHA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 637
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	5	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.58	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	467/1397	4.56	4.54	4.28	4.38	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	548/1583	4.44	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	469/1532	4.38	4.25	4.01	4.07	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	441/1504	4.44	4.38	4.05	4.20	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	575/1612	4.44	4.61	4.16	4.18	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1447/1635	4.11	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.41	4.08	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.72	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	943/1295	3.57	4.41	3.94	4.01	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.56	4.07	4.23	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.69	4.30	4.48	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.70	4.28	4.50	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.36	3.93	4.24	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 470 0101
 Title EMERG RESPONSE TO CRIS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 638
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	7	2	3.85	1296/1639	3.85	4.58	4.27	4.42	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1204/1397	3.69	4.54	4.28	4.38	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1254/1583	3.77	4.45	4.19	4.31	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	1	3	2	2.75	1477/1532	2.75	4.25	4.01	4.07	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1194/1504	3.54	4.38	4.05	4.20	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.61	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	5	1	3.58	1279/1579	3.58	4.41	4.08	4.21	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	770/1518	4.54	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	872/1520	4.77	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	833/1517	4.31	4.72	4.27	4.34	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	912/1550	4.23	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	963/1295	3.54	4.41	3.94	4.01	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.56	4.07	4.23	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	839/1391	4.22	4.69	4.30	4.48	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1043/1388	3.89	4.70	4.28	4.50	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.36	3.93	4.24	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 471 0101
 Title EMS SYSTEMS & ASSESSME
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 639
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.58	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.38	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1532	4.83	4.25	4.01	4.07	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.38	4.05	4.20	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1612	4.83	4.61	4.16	4.18	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.41	4.08	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.72	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.72	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.41	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.69	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.70	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.36	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.00	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.84	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 53	4.50	4.61	4.05	4.58	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.67	4.75	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 37	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.73	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 32	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.64	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant