

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 579
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	0	3	18	13	4.03	1083/1504	4.03	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	19	11	4.03	1039/1503	4.03	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	11	17	4.14	873/1290	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	1	5	14	11	3.85	1136/1453	3.85	4.03	4.21	4.20	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	1	11	17	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.96	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	9	11	12	3.70	1040/1365	3.70	3.81	4.08	4.00	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	9	22	4.38	625/1485	4.38	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	674/1504	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	8	14	6	3.73	1135/1483	3.73	3.81	4.06	4.02	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	8	24	4.49	807/1425	4.49	4.34	4.41	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	3	4	12	15	3.89	1346/1426	3.89	4.55	4.69	4.71	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	8	20	4.27	828/1418	4.27	4.34	4.25	4.22	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	7	12	17	4.19	929/1416	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	3	9	5	17	3.89	757/1199	3.89	4.35	3.97	3.95	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	3	8	8	3.78	887/1312	3.78	4.16	4.00	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	845/1303	4.17	4.25	4.24	4.23	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	768/1299	4.30	4.31	4.25	4.21	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	2	2	2	4	10	3.90	471/ 758	3.90	4.19	4.01	3.89	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 76	****	4.11	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 73	****	4.67	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.73	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	3.95	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.97	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.54	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.87	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.44	****

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 579
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	38	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: LEBOWITZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 580
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	741/1290	4.30	4.24	4.28	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	247/1421	4.60	3.96	4.00	4.01	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	726/1365	4.10	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	938/1485	4.10	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	7	2	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.33	3.81	4.06	4.08	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	1169/1426	4.44	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	772/1418	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	329/1199	4.44	4.35	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	877/1312	3.80	4.16	4.00	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1092/1299	3.60	4.31	4.25	4.30	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.19	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT
 Instructor: MAGUIRE, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 581
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	2	6	4.27	864/1504	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.24	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.96	4.00	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	358/1365	4.45	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	150/1485	4.80	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	6	0	3.44	1258/1483	3.44	3.81	4.06	4.08	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	736/1425	4.55	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	714/1426	4.82	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	485/1416	4.64	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	82/1199	4.89	4.35	3.97	4.02	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.19	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.11	4.61	4.84	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	36/ 73	4.33	4.67	4.17	4.25	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 311 0101
 Title STRESS/BURNOUT EMER PE
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 582
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	8	4.42	684/1504	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	628/1290	4.42	4.24	4.28	4.31	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	855/1453	4.18	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	1	7	3.83	919/1421	3.83	3.96	4.00	4.01	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1025/1365	3.73	3.81	4.08	4.08	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	761/1485	4.25	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	338/1483	4.50	3.81	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	224/1199	4.58	4.35	3.97	4.02	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	493/1312	4.38	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	354/ 758	4.14	4.19	4.01	4.00	4.14
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101
 Title MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 583
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	750/1504	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	618/1503	4.42	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	988/1290	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.31	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	974/1453	4.05	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	3	9	3.95	815/1421	3.95	3.96	4.00	4.01	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	2	6	6	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	3.81	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	1	7	7	3.84	1122/1485	3.84	3.94	4.16	4.17	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	854/1504	4.79	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	821/1483	4.06	3.81	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	940/1425	4.37	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	940/1426	4.68	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	790/1418	4.32	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	554/1416	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	3	2	9	3.78	810/1199	3.78	4.35	3.97	4.02	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	689/1312	4.10	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	678/1299	4.40	4.31	4.25	4.30	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	478/ 758	3.88	4.19	4.01	4.00	3.88
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	36/ 58	4.73	4.73	4.43	4.52	4.73
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	40/ 56	4.00	3.95	4.23	4.13	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	30/ 44	4.63	3.97	4.65	4.77	4.63
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	3.54	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	26/ 39	4.38	3.87	4.44	4.47	4.38
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 350 0101
 Title SUPERVISION:EHS SYSTEM
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 584
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	15	4.79	228/1504	4.79	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	472/1503	4.53	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	270/1290	4.74	4.24	4.28	4.31	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	363/1453	4.58	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	200/1421	4.68	3.96	4.00	4.01	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	282/1365	4.53	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	495/1485	4.47	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	968/1504	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	543/1483	4.33	3.81	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	366/1425	4.79	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	940/1426	4.68	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	219/1418	4.79	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	420/1416	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	96/1199	4.83	4.35	3.97	4.02	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	488/1303	4.63	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	293/1299	4.81	4.31	4.25	4.30	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	4.19	4.01	4.00	4.60

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	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 351 0101
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:E
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 585
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	482/1504	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	230/1290	4.78	4.24	4.28	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	374/1421	4.44	3.96	4.00	4.01	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	370/1365	4.44	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	230/1485	4.72	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	195/1483	4.69	3.81	4.06	4.08	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	303/1418	4.72	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	359/1199	4.41	4.35	3.97	4.02	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	234/1312	4.69	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.25	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	415/1299	4.69	4.31	4.25	4.30	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	160/ 758	4.58	4.19	4.01	4.00	4.58
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.73	4.43	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****

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	1	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 586
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1302/1504	3.67	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.08	4.20	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	0	5	2	3.45	1144/1421	3.45	3.96	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	3.81	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	866/1485	4.17	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1197/1483	3.60	3.81	4.06	4.08	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.34	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1001/1416	4.08	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.35	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	354/ 758	4.14	4.19	4.01	4.00	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.11	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.67	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.73	4.43	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 451 0101
 Title FIELD EXPERIENCE IN EH
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 587
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.08	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.03	4.21	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.81	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	3.94	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.34	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.35	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.16	4.00	4.07	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.11	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.63	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.67	4.17	4.29	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.73	4.43	4.83	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	3.95	4.23	4.37	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	3.97	4.65	4.33	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	3.54	4.29	4.12	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	3.87	4.44	4.19	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.53	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	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
? 0

Other

2

Course-Section: EHS 474 0101
 Title INTRO TO MED EMERGENCI
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 588
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	4	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1375/1503	3.29	4.08	4.20	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1267/1290	2.71	4.24	4.28	4.32	2.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	4.03	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	3.81	4.08	4.09	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	2.86	1415/1485	2.86	3.94	4.16	4.14	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1340/1483	3.20	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.34	4.41	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1290/1426	4.20	4.55	4.69	4.72	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	542/1199	4.20	4.35	3.97	4.05	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1312	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1303	****	4.25	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	4.31	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.19	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 476 0101
 Title INTRO TRAUMA EMERGENCI
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 589
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.43	4.08	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1205/1290	3.29	4.24	4.28	4.32	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.03	4.21	4.22	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	3.81	4.08	4.09	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1471/1485	2.29	3.94	4.16	4.14	2.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1408/1483	2.86	3.81	4.06	4.11	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.34	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1373/1426	3.67	4.55	4.69	4.72	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1131/1416	3.83	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	860/1199	3.67	4.35	3.97	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	4.16	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1246/1303	2.50	4.25	4.24	4.34	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.00	4.31	4.25	4.38	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.19	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 477 0101
 Title SPECIAL POPULATIONS
 Instructor: LENK, CRISTA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 590
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	327/1504	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	795/1503	4.31	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	741/1290	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1083/1453	3.92	4.03	4.21	4.22	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1049/1421	3.62	3.96	4.00	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	6	1	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	3.81	4.08	4.09	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	866/1485	4.17	3.94	4.16	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1186/1504	4.38	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	11	0	3.69	1157/1483	3.69	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1136/1425	4.08	4.34	4.41	4.38	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.55	4.69	4.72	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	987/1418	4.08	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	740/1416	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	548/1199	4.18	4.35	3.97	4.05	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1312	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.25	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.31	4.25	4.38	****

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	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 478 0101
 Title FIELD OPERATIONS IN EM
 Instructor: STRAIGHT, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 591
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.08	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.03	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57	1073/1421	3.57	3.96	4.00	4.02	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	3.81	4.08	4.09	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	240/1485	4.71	3.94	4.16	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1147/1483	3.71	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.34	4.41	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	574/1199	4.14	4.35	3.97	4.05	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.16	4.00	4.07	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.31	4.25	4.38	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	4.19	4.01	4.17	4.25
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 481 0101
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I
 Instructor: PARKISON, KAREN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 592
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	509/1504	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	3	1	2.77	1459/1503	2.77	4.08	4.20	4.18	2.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.24	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1427/1453	2.89	4.03	4.21	4.22	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1421	****	3.96	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	1	1	3	0	2.20	1356/1365	2.20	3.81	4.08	4.09	2.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	2	2	1	1	2.08	1476/1485	2.08	3.94	4.16	4.14	2.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	1006/1504	4.64	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	7	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1423/1483	2.75	3.81	4.06	4.11	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1425	****	4.34	4.41	4.38	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.55	4.69	4.72	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1418	****	4.34	4.25	4.25	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1312	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	****	4.25	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1299	****	4.31	4.25	4.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	41/ 58	4.46	4.73	4.43	4.83	4.46
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	4	2	6	1	0	2.31	51/ 56	2.31	3.95	4.23	4.37	2.31
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	5	3	2	1	2	0	2.25	44/ 44	2.25	3.97	4.65	4.33	2.25
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	7	2	4	0	0	0	1.67	47/ 47	1.67	3.54	4.29	4.12	1.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	8	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	39/ 39	2.60	3.87	4.44	4.19	2.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 483 0101
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I
 Instructor: PARKISON, KAREN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 593
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					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	1	1	3	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.03	4.21	4.22	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	3.96	4.00	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.81	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1146/1485	3.80	3.94	4.16	4.14	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	338/1483	4.50	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1425	****	4.34	4.41	4.38	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1426	****	4.55	4.69	4.72	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1418	****	4.34	4.25	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1416	****	4.32	4.26	4.26	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	4.35	3.97	4.05	****

Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.75	4.73	4.43	4.83	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	29/ 56	4.50	3.95	4.23	4.37	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	3.97	4.65	4.33	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	40/ 47	3.50	3.54	4.29	4.12	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	36/ 39	3.50	3.87	4.44	4.19	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 492 0101
 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I
 Instructor: PARKISON, KAREN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 594
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1477/1504	2.80	4.28	4.27	4.33	2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1478/1503	2.60	4.08	4.20	4.18	2.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.24	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.03	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	3.96	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	3.81	4.08	4.09	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	3.94	4.16	4.14	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1474/1504	3.60	4.67	4.69	4.73	3.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1415/1425	2.00	4.34	4.41	4.38	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1393/1418	2.50	4.34	4.25	4.25	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1378/1416	2.50	4.32	4.26	4.26	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	4.35	3.97	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1312	****	4.16	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1303	****	4.25	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1299	****	4.31	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	4.19	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	76/ 76	2.67	4.11	4.61	4.63	2.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.67	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						