

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 949
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	21	4.57	505/1423	4.57	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	1159/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	1	6	7	10	3.55	1193/1585	3.55	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	24	4.70	298/1651	4.70	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	778/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	13	8	4.21	783/1656	4.21	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	410/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	1183/1585	4.55	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	259/1582	4.79	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	295/1575	4.79	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	9	5	13	4.07	635/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	993/1515	4.10	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	798/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	2	1	2	9	4.07	456/ 994	4.07	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 949
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 950
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	354/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	554/1674	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	482/1423	4.59	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	552/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	692/1585	4.12	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	427/1535	4.46	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.94	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	437/1656	4.47	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	960/1586	4.44	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	496/1582	4.63	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	333/1380	4.47	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	131/ 994	4.71	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 950
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101
 Title ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: Keenan, Kip
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 951
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	195/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	145/1674	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	203/1423	4.80	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	252/1609	4.72	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	268/1535	4.63	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	127/1651	4.89	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	1001/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	123/1656	4.87	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	128/1586	4.95	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	86/1380	4.89	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	206/1520	4.79	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	348/1515	4.79	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101
 Title ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: Keenan, Kip
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 951
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 952
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	79/1423	4.95	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	148/1585	4.79	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	154/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	121/1651	4.89	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		