

Course-Section: EHS 100 0101  
 Title FRESHMAN EXPERIENCE EH  
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 649  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	0	2	2.75	1633/1649	2.75	4.21	4.28	4.11	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.10	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1242/1595	3.83	4.19	4.20	4.03	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	986/1533	3.83	3.98	4.04	3.87	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.18	4.10	3.86	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1222/1623	3.83	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.18	4.06	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1401/1568	3.75	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1235/1564	3.88	4.48	4.28	4.20	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1277/1559	3.75	4.45	4.29	4.20	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.19	3.98	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	987/1384	3.71	4.31	4.08	3.86	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.54	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.23	3.95	3.75	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	5						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER  
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 650  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	8	18	13	3.74	1381/1649	3.74	4.21	4.28	4.29	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	8	10	17	11	3.67	1401/1648	3.67	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	6	9	13	14	3.59	1176/1375	3.59	4.28	4.27	4.37	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	6	12	10	14	3.64	1353/1595	3.64	4.19	4.20	4.22	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	6	8	12	18	3.83	996/1533	3.83	3.98	4.04	4.04	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	8	8	17	7	3.24	1383/1512	3.24	4.18	4.10	4.14	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	8	14	18	3.96	1104/1623	3.96	4.29	4.16	4.21	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	18	27	4.57	1139/1646	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	16	21	4	3.64	1274/1621	3.69	4.18	4.06	4.01	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	15	26	4.40	992/1568	4.46	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	10	35	4.67	1071/1572	4.68	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	17	22	4.21	992/1564	4.26	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	6	6	11	22	3.96	1159/1559	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.33	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	7	15	22	4.13	616/1352	4.22	4.19	3.98	4.07	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	6	4	11	8	3.39	1127/1384	3.39	4.31	4.08	3.99	3.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	5	10	3	13	3.61	1175/1382	3.61	4.45	4.29	4.19	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	5	4	8	15	3.94	1006/1368	3.94	4.54	4.30	4.21	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	18	4	0	3	2	6	3.40	746/ 948	3.40	4.23	3.95	3.89	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	3	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	2	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	3	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	5.00	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER  
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 650  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	14	Under-grad	48	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 651  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	7	8	18	13	3.74	1381/1649	3.74	4.21	4.28	4.29	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	8	10	17	11	3.67	1401/1648	3.67	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	6	9	13	14	3.59	1176/1375	3.59	4.28	4.27	4.37	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	6	12	10	14	3.64	1353/1595	3.64	4.19	4.20	4.22	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	6	8	12	18	3.83	996/1533	3.83	3.98	4.04	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	8	8	17	7	3.24	1383/1512	3.24	4.18	4.10	4.14	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	8	14	18	3.96	1104/1623	3.96	4.29	4.16	4.21	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	18	27	4.57	1139/1646	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	0	10	18	4	3.73	1217/1621	3.69	4.18	4.06	4.01	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	3	11	22	4.53	827/1568	4.46	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	1034/1572	4.68	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	3	16	16	4.31	887/1564	4.26	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	1	6	11	16	4.14	1045/1559	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.33	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	2	5	9	21	4.32	465/1352	4.22	4.19	3.98	4.07	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	6	4	11	8	3.39	1127/1384	3.39	4.31	4.08	3.99	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	5	10	3	13	3.61	1175/1382	3.61	4.45	4.29	4.19	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	5	4	8	15	3.94	1006/1368	3.94	4.54	4.30	4.21	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	15	18	4	0	3	2	6	3.40	746/ 948	3.40	4.23	3.95	3.89	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	3	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	2	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	3	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	5.00	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 651  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	14	Under-grad	48	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 300 0101  
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE  
 Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 652  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.21	4.28	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	740/1533	4.11	3.98	4.04	4.05	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	331/1512	4.57	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	600/1564	4.56	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.23	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.19	3.98	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.31	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.45	4.29	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.54	4.30	4.39	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.23	3.95	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		0
			? 2		
					8

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EHS 301 0101  
 Title PLANNING EMER HLTH SYS  
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 653  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.21	4.28	4.27	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1017/1533	3.80	3.98	4.04	4.05	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	310/1512	4.60	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1364/1646	4.30	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	914/1352	3.75	4.19	3.98	3.97	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.31	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	4.23	3.95	4.00	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 2
84-150	3	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 9	
			? 1		

Course-Section: EHS 320 0101  
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 654  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.21	4.28	4.27	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1044/1375	3.89	4.28	4.27	4.22	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1400/1533	3.17	3.98	4.04	4.05	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	826/1512	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1318/1623	3.67	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	697/1646	4.89	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	791/1568	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	728/1564	4.44	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.45	4.29	4.23	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	534/1352	4.22	4.19	3.98	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.45	4.29	4.37	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.54	4.30	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	678/ 948	3.60	4.23	3.95	4.00	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EHS 352 0101  
 Title MICRO COMP APPS HLTH M  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 655  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.21	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.19	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.98	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	654/1621	4.29	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.19	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.31	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.23	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	5.00	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: EHS 352 0101  
 Title MICRO COMP APPS HLTH M  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 655  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
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	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 656  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	4.21	4.28	4.27	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.98	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.45	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	515/1352	4.25	4.19	3.98	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.23	3.95	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 430 0101  
 Title RESEARCH TOPICS IN EHS  
 Instructor: BISSELL, RICHA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 657  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1540/1649	3.33	4.21	4.28	4.50	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	5	5	3.60	1448/1648	3.60	4.31	4.23	4.36	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	1055/1375	3.87	4.28	4.27	4.48	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	5	3.67	1335/1595	3.67	4.19	4.20	4.36	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	3	3.47	1276/1533	3.47	3.98	4.04	4.14	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	8	3	3.60	1202/1512	3.60	4.18	4.10	4.26	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	4.29	4.16	4.27	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.93	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	2	7	0	3.17	1473/1621	3.17	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1326/1568	3.93	4.53	4.43	4.54	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	1435/1572	4.14	4.77	4.70	4.79	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	1403/1564	3.47	4.48	4.28	4.40	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1385/1559	3.47	4.45	4.29	4.41	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	3.15	1192/1352	3.15	4.19	3.98	4.07	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.56	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.54	4.30	4.58	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	564/ 948	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.31	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 451 0101  
 Title FIELD EXPERIENCE IN EH  
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 658  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.21	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.36	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.42	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.59	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	5.00	3.68	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 470 0101  
 Title EMERG RESPONSE TO CRIS  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 659  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	603/1649	4.54	4.21	4.28	4.50	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	427/1648	4.62	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	593/1375	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.48	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1015/1595	4.09	4.19	4.20	4.36	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.98	4.04	4.14	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.18	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	659/1623	4.38	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568	4.69	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1572	4.92	4.77	4.70	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	326/1564	4.77	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559	4.62	4.45	4.29	4.41	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	650/1352	4.08	4.19	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.45	4.29	4.56	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.54	4.30	4.58	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	170/ 948	4.60	4.23	3.95	4.31	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: EHS 475 0101  
 Title RESP & CRIT ILL PATIEN  
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 660  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.21	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1648	4.88	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.48	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.19	4.20	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1533	4.75	3.98	4.04	4.14	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.18	4.10	4.26	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1081/1646	4.63	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	234/1352	4.63	4.19	3.98	4.07	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.31	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.54	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.23	3.95	4.31	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	8	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	1	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 0						
				I 0	Other	6				
				? 1						