

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101  
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY  
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 928  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	6	24	4.51	604/1639	4.51	4.44	4.27	4.08	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	12	22	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.47	4.22	4.17	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	7	27	4.69	350/1397	4.69	4.13	4.28	4.18	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	1	2	6	15	4.19	852/1583	4.19	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	10	7	15	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.27	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	576/1504	4.29	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	5	27	4.69	293/1612	4.69	4.60	4.16	4.10	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	199/1635	4.97	4.93	4.65	4.56	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	2	6	11	6	3.73	1185/1579	3.73	4.18	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	30	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.72	4.43	4.38	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	5	26	4.57	1136/1520	4.57	4.80	4.70	4.61	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	5	25	4.49	622/1517	4.49	4.57	4.27	4.20	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	1	8	23	4.58	556/1550	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	2	3	11	13	4.10	577/1295	4.10	4.16	3.94	3.84	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	3	4	14	4.13	721/1398	4.13	4.27	4.07	3.85	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	586/1391	4.54	4.65	4.30	4.07	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	712/1388	4.43	4.61	4.28	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	2	2	4	3	5	3.44	755/ 958	3.44	3.70	3.93	3.71	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101  
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY  
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 928  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	37	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101  
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE  
 Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 929  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	9	4.15	959/1639	4.15	4.47	4.22	4.27	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	946/1397	4.08	4.13	4.28	4.39	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	1465/1583	3.33	4.02	4.19	4.28	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.27	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1278/1504	3.38	4.14	4.05	4.09	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1612	4.77	4.60	4.16	4.21	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.93	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	841/1579	4.08	4.18	4.08	4.14	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	213/1518	4.91	4.72	4.43	4.48	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.16	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	929/1398	3.80	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.65	4.30	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	0	8	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	888/ 958	2.80	3.70	3.93	4.00	2.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101  
 Title ENVNRMTL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: KEENAN, KIP  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 930  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	29	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.47	4.22	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	175/1397	4.89	4.13	4.28	4.38	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	260/1583	4.74	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.27	4.01	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.60	4.16	4.18	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	943/1635	4.72	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	0	0	6	17	4.58	302/1579	4.58	4.18	4.08	4.21	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	242/1518	4.88	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.80	4.70	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	173/1517	4.88	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	156/1550	4.91	4.48	4.22	4.24	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	57/1295	4.93	4.16	3.94	4.01	4.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	225/1398	4.79	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.65	4.30	4.48	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	351/1388	4.78	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	163/ 958	4.65	3.70	3.93	4.24	4.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 402 0101  
 Title ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: KEENAN, KIP  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 930  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	35	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Title

Baltimore County

FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. A)

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 35

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	2	1	13	17	4.36	788/1639	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	7	10	14	4.13	992/1639	4.13	4.47	4.22	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	6	13	3	6	3.10	1354/1397	3.10	4.13	4.28	4.38	3.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	6	10	10	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.02	4.19	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	10	14	3.97	828/1532	3.97	4.27	4.01	4.07	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	2	14	11	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	1	10	17	4.19	892/1612	4.19	4.60	4.16	4.18	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	265/1635	4.97	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	0	4	12	6	3.83	1109/1579	3.83	4.18	4.08	4.21	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	10	20	4.45	877/1518	4.41	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	943/1520	4.68	4.80	4.70	4.75	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	11	18	4.36	768/1517	4.32	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	11	14	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.48	4.22	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	2	0	4	9	9	3.96	677/1295	3.96	4.16	3.94	4.01	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	13	12	4.06	749/1398	4.06	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	534/1391	4.61	4.65	4.30	4.48	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	558/1388	4.61	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	4	1	4	9	7	3.56	699/ 958	3.56	3.70	3.93	4.24	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Title

Baltimore County

FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 35

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	2	1	13	17	4.36	788/1639	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	7	10	14	4.13	992/1639	4.13	4.47	4.22	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	6	13	3	6	3.10	1354/1397	3.10	4.13	4.28	4.38	3.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	6	10	10	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.02	4.19	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	10	14	3.97	828/1532	3.97	4.27	4.01	4.07	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	2	14	11	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	1	10	17	4.19	892/1612	4.19	4.60	4.16	4.18	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	265/1635	4.97	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1579	3.83	4.18	4.08	4.21	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	989/1518	4.41	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1074/1520	4.68	4.80	4.70	4.75	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	864/1517	4.32	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.48	4.22	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	6	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1295	3.96	4.16	3.94	4.01	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	13	12	4.06	749/1398	4.06	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	534/1391	4.61	4.65	4.30	4.48	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	558/1388	4.61	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	4	1	4	9	7	3.56	699/ 958	3.56	3.70	3.93	4.24	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	11

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

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101  
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 933  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	51/1639	4.97	4.47	4.22	4.29	4.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	65/1397	4.97	4.13	4.28	4.38	4.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	22	4.55	423/1583	4.55	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	105/1532	4.90	4.27	4.01	4.07	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	4	20	4.52	359/1504	4.52	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	113/1612	4.90	4.60	4.16	4.18	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.18	4.08	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.72	4.43	4.51	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	110/1517	4.93	4.57	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	219/1550	4.87	4.48	4.22	4.24	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	3	1	1	10	3.82	791/1295	3.82	4.16	3.94	4.01	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	242/1398	4.77	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	227/1391	4.91	4.65	4.30	4.48	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	201/1388	4.91	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	2	3	12	4.21	369/ 958	4.21	3.70	3.93	4.24	4.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 497 0101  
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 933  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	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	23				
				?	1						