

Course-Section: EHS 100 1  
 Title Freshman Experience EH  
 Instructor: Walz,Bruce J  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 558  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	911/1509	4.22	4.68	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	3	3.78	1246/1509	3.78	4.51	4.26	4.25	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	****	4.50	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.53	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.37	4.09	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	742/1384	4.11	4.37	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1254/1489	3.63	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1280/1506	4.22	4.71	4.67	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	750/1463	4.14	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.72	4.46	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	768/1411	4.38	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	799/1236	3.86	4.35	4.00	3.87	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.36	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.57	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	4.42	4.03	3.89	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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	2	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	493/1509	4.59	4.68	4.31	4.34	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	574/1509	4.48	4.51	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	315/1287	4.70	4.50	4.30	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	586/1459	4.42	4.53	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	6	14	4.36	478/1406	4.36	4.37	4.09	4.09	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	6	15	4.35	518/1384	4.35	4.37	4.11	4.09	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	151/1489	4.80	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	11	14	4.56	1022/1506	4.56	4.71	4.67	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	567/1463	4.32	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	175/1438	4.93	4.72	4.46	4.48	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	429/1421	4.93	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	190/1411	4.85	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	20	4.63	513/1405	4.63	4.67	4.32	4.39	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	229/1236	4.58	4.35	4.00	4.11	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	487/1260	4.42	4.36	4.14	4.19	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	602/1255	4.47	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.57	4.38	4.44	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 873	****	4.42	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.83	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.83	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.69	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.83	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.83	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.90	4.39	4.79
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.68	4.41	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.81	4.51	4.83
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.67	4.18	4.56
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.39	4.32	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: EHS 200 1  
 Title Concepts Emer Hlth Ser  
 Instructor: Krumperman, Kurt  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 559  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 11	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 29 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 301 1  
 Title Planning Emer Hlth Sys  
 Instructor: Krumperman, Kurt  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 560  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.68	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.51	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	141/1459	4.82	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	563/1406	4.27	4.37	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1205/1506	4.33	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.72	4.46	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	489/1236	4.25	4.35	4.00	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	337/1260	4.63	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1255	4.63	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.57	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.82	4.51	4.26	4.25	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	199/1287	4.82	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/1459	4.89	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	90/1406	4.90	4.37	4.09	4.12	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	92/1489	4.91	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.71	4.72	4.46	4.43	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.94	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.94	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	199/1236	4.31	4.35	4.00	4.07	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.57	4.38	4.42	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.83	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.83	4.22	4.17	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.69	4.48	4.52	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.83	4.36	4.30	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.90	4.39	4.61	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.68	4.41	4.34	4.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.81	4.51	4.62	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.67	4.18	4.47	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 44	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.40	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EHS 302 1  
 Title Clincl Concepts/Practi  
 Instructor: Williams JR,Gar (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 561  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 302 1  
 Title Clincl Concepts/Practi  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 562  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.82	4.51	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	199/1287	4.82	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/1459	4.89	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	90/1406	4.90	4.37	4.09	4.12	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	92/1489	4.91	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.71	4.72	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.94	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.94	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	664/1236	4.31	4.35	4.00	4.07	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.57	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.83	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.83	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.69	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.83	4.36	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.90	4.39	4.61	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.68	4.41	4.34	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.81	4.51	4.62	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.67	4.18	4.47	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 44	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.40	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: EHS 302 1  
 Title Clincl Concepts/Practi  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 562  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 5	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		



Course-Section: EHS 320 1  
 Title Disaster Management  
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 563  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.68	4.31	4.32	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.51	4.26	4.25	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	491/1287	4.54	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	638/1459	4.38	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	1	7	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.37	4.09	4.12	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	269/1384	4.62	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	619/1489	4.38	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	175/1438	4.92	4.72	4.46	4.43	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1411	4.85	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	419/1405	4.69	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	205/1236	4.62	4.35	4.00	4.07	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	412/1255	4.70	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.57	4.38	4.42	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	77/ 873	4.89	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.83	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.83	4.22	4.17	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.69	4.48	4.52	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.83	4.36	4.30	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.83	4.18	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.90	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.68	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.81	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.39	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EHS 320 1  
 Title Disaster Management  
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 563  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 352 1  
 Title Micro Comp Apps Hlth M  
 Instructor: Hodgson,Luke J  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 564  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.51	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.53	4.22	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.71	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.72	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.35	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.57	4.38	4.42	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 430 1  
 Title Research Topics In EHS  
 Instructor: Bissell, Richard  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 565  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.51	4.26	4.26	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.53	4.22	4.32	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.37	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	440/1384	4.40	4.37	4.11	4.23	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1222/1506	4.30	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1032/1438	4.30	4.72	4.46	4.50	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1275/1421	4.30	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	841/1411	4.30	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.35	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.36	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	742/1258	4.38	4.57	4.38	4.51	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.42	4.03	4.26	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 2
84-150	2	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	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: EHS 470 1  
 Title Emerg Response To Cris  
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 566  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	698/1509	4.43	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	667/1509	4.43	4.51	4.26	4.26	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	755/1287	4.29	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.53	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	287/1406	4.57	4.37	4.09	4.11	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.37	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	875/1489	4.14	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	106/1463	4.83	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.72	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.86	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	393/1405	4.71	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	147/1236	4.71	4.35	4.00	4.03	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.36	4.14	4.25	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.53	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.57	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.42	4.03	4.26	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
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		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: EHS 471 1  
 Title Ems Systems & Assessme  
 Instructor: Polk,Dwight A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 567  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1509	4.94	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	184/1509	4.82	4.51	4.26	4.26	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	315/1287	4.71	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.53	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	9	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.37	4.09	4.11	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.37	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	233/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.71	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	235/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	430/1438	4.76	4.72	4.46	4.50	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	482/1411	4.61	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1405	4.94	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	373/1236	4.39	4.35	4.00	4.03	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.36	4.14	4.25	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	611/1255	4.47	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.57	4.38	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.42	4.03	4.26	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.83	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.83	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.69	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	4.83	4.36	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 472 1  
 Title Prin Of Pharmacology  
 Instructor: Stair,Randy G.  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 568  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	842/1509	4.29	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1339/1509	3.59	4.51	4.26	4.26	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	3	3.29	1213/1287	3.29	4.50	4.30	4.38	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.53	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	6	5	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.37	4.09	4.11	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1001/1384	3.82	4.37	4.11	4.23	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1006/1506	4.59	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1242/1438	3.94	4.72	4.46	4.50	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1037/1421	4.65	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1242/1411	3.65	4.66	4.31	4.35	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	1188/1405	3.76	4.67	4.32	4.34	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	969/1236	3.54	4.35	4.00	4.03	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1200/1260	2.90	4.36	4.14	4.25	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1104/1255	3.60	4.53	4.33	4.46	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1013/1258	3.90	4.57	4.38	4.51	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	671/ 873	3.60	4.42	4.03	4.26	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 17	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major 3
84-150	2	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	0			
				? 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1509	4.94	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	311/1509	4.71	4.51	4.26	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1287	4.69	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	421/1459	4.54	4.53	4.22	4.32	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	656/1406	4.20	4.37	4.09	4.11	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.37	4.11	4.23	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	364/1489	4.59	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.71	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	424/1463	4.44	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	175/1438	4.92	4.72	4.46	4.50	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	429/1421	4.92	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	376/1411	4.69	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	239/1405	4.85	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	545/1236	4.18	4.35	4.00	4.03	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	535/1260	4.36	4.36	4.14	4.25	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	698/1255	4.36	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	807/1258	4.27	4.57	4.38	4.51	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.42	4.03	4.26	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	21/ 184	4.83	4.83	4.16	4.62	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	24/ 198	4.83	4.83	4.22	4.37	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	68/ 184	4.69	4.69	4.48	4.66	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 177	4.83	4.83	4.36	4.47	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 165	4.83	4.83	4.18	4.29	4.83
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	21/ 48	4.71	4.90	4.39	4.75	4.71
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	17/ 48	4.71	4.68	4.41	4.54	4.71
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	31/ 47	4.43	4.81	4.51	4.51	4.43
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	29/ 47	4.00	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	35/ 44	3.83	4.39	4.32	4.07	3.83
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	Under-grad 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0

#### - Means there are not enough



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