

Course-Section: EHS 100 0101
 Title FRESHMAN EXPERIENCE EH
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 674
 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	1	3	4	2	3.70	1429/1674	3.70	4.50	4.27	4.07	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	870/1674	4.30	4.36	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.16	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.16	4.22	4.05	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.43	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.19	4.07	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1118/1585	4.63	4.85	4.69	4.60	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1230/1575	3.88	4.48	4.27	4.17	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	603/1380	4.13	4.41	3.94	3.78	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.28	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.47	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.15	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.31	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 675
 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	7	11	8	4.04	1171/1674	4.04	4.50	4.27	4.32	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	7	6	8	5	3.42	1531/1674	3.42	4.36	4.23	4.26	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	9	7	4	3.27	1330/1423	3.27	4.23	4.27	4.36	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	4	3	9	4	3.41	1484/1609	3.41	4.16	4.22	4.23	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	4	4	10	6	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	3.69	3.96	3.91	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	9	8	2	3.16	1414/1535	3.16	4.03	4.08	4.03	3.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	6	7	10	3.92	1201/1651	3.92	4.43	4.18	4.20	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	987/1673	4.73	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	13	5	1	3.24	1482/1656	3.24	4.19	4.07	4.10	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	738/1586	4.62	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	6	19	4.62	1130/1585	4.62	4.85	4.69	4.76	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	14	7	4.04	1114/1582	4.04	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	12	8	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.48	4.27	4.39	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	8	9	7	3.77	894/1380	3.77	4.41	3.94	4.03	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1122/1520	3.62	4.28	4.01	4.03	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1318/1515	3.46	4.47	4.24	4.28	3.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1338/1511	3.38	4.49	4.27	4.28	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	871/ 994	3.11	4.33	3.94	3.98	3.11	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.30	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.15	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	4.31	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.57	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.08	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 675
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 300 0101
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE
 Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 676
 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	4	2	4.14	1075/1674	4.14	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	431/1423	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1495/1585	2.88	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	4.03	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	133/1651	4.88	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1114/1673	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	871/1656	4.13	4.19	4.07	4.07	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	463/1380	4.29	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EHS 301 0101
 Title PLANNING EMER HLTH SYS
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 677
 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	7	13	4.65	419/1674	4.65	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	517/1423	4.55	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	432/1609	4.55	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	512/1585	4.30	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	298/1651	4.70	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	214/1656	4.71	4.19	4.07	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	353/1582	4.72	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	549/1380	4.19	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1515	4.56	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	254/ 994	4.44	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.60	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.50	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.15	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.31	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.57	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.08	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: EHS 301 0101
 Title PLANNING EMER HLTH SYS
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 677
 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	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 678
 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	12	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	878/1423	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	963/1609	4.17	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1585	4.64	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1006/1535	3.92	4.03	4.08	4.15	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	1491/1673	4.15	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.19	4.07	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	363/1380	4.43	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	390/ 994	4.20	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.60	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.50	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.15	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.31	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.57	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.08	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 678
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 679
 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	3	5	4.63	458/1674	4.63	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.43	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.19	4.07	4.07	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.41	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.34	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.10	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.29	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.14	3.48	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 320 0101
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 680
 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	1	9	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	894/1423	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	1495/1585	2.88	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	493/1656	4.71	4.19	4.07	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	453/1586	4.89	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	578/1582	4.61	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	192/1575	4.78	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1380	4.94	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1520	4.38	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	95/ 994	4.80	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.60	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.50	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****	

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	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 320 0101
 Title DISASTER MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 681
 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	1	9	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	894/1423	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	1495/1585	2.88	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	4.71	4.19	4.07	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	4.89	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.61	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.78	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.94	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1520	4.38	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	95/ 994	4.80	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.60	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.50	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****	

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	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 345 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: SMITH-CUMBERLAN
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 682
 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	4	10	20	4.47	655/1674	4.47	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	20	4.41	721/1674	4.41	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	20	4.29	811/1423	4.29	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	13	16	4.26	839/1609	4.26	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	12	7	11	3.76	1049/1585	3.76	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	10	15	4.09	832/1535	4.09	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	8	20	4.32	781/1651	4.32	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	212/1673	4.97	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	5	17	6	3.81	1200/1656	3.81	4.19	4.07	4.07	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	24	4.61	753/1586	4.61	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	689/1585	4.85	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	10	22	4.56	578/1582	4.56	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	24	4.53	669/1575	4.53	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	6	24	4.59	253/1380	4.59	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	5	7	6	11	3.79	994/1520	3.79	4.28	4.01	4.09	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	7	3	16	4.07	1005/1515	4.07	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	516/1511	4.66	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 22	Graduate	0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 345H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SMITH-CUMBERLAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 683
 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	3	3	9	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1131/1423	3.86	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1055/1609	4.07	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	865/1585	3.93	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	844/1535	4.07	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	855/1651	4.27	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	10	0	3.71	1267/1656	3.71	4.19	4.07	4.07	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	664/1585	4.87	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1099/1582	4.07	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	658/1575	4.53	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	284/1380	4.53	4.41	3.94	4.01	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	568/ 994	3.91	4.33	3.94	3.96	3.91	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	39/ 76	4.15	4.15	3.98	4.03	4.15	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	28/ 77	4.31	4.31	3.93	3.70	4.31	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	27/ 53	4.57	4.57	4.45	3.87	4.57	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	25/ 48	4.08	4.08	4.12	3.67	4.08	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	8	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	34/ 49	4.00	4.00	4.27	3.27	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 684
 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	6	4	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	6	2	3.60	1164/1585	3.60	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	298/1651	4.70	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1177/1656	3.83	4.19	4.07	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1582	4.80	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.48	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	810/1380	3.89	4.41	3.94	4.01	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	673/1520	4.22	4.28	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	707/1515	4.44	4.47	4.24	4.32	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	707/1511	4.44	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	270/ 994	4.43	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.60	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.00	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.50	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.15	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.31	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.57	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.08	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 684
 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	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 430 0101
 Title RESEARCH TOPICS IN EHS
 Instructor: BISSELL, RICHA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 685
 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	1	2	9	8	4.20	1026/1674	4.20	4.50	4.27	4.42	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	648/1423	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	715/1609	4.35	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	7	2	3.15	1404/1585	3.15	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	7	6	3.95	946/1535	3.95	4.03	4.08	4.18	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.43	4.18	4.23	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1169/1673	4.55	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	12	4	4.05	924/1656	4.05	4.19	4.07	4.19	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	678/1586	4.65	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.85	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	829/1582	4.35	4.49	4.26	4.31	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	768/1575	4.45	4.48	4.27	4.35	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	810/1380	3.89	4.41	3.94	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.28	4.01	4.18	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	694/1515	4.45	4.47	4.24	4.40	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	535/1511	4.64	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	420/ 994	4.14	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 470 0101
 Title EMERG RESPONSE TO CRIS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 686
 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	2	0	1	3	13	4.32	878/1674	4.32	4.50	4.27	4.42	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	6	10	4.16	1035/1674	4.16	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	7	7	3.84	1135/1423	3.84	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	6	3.95	1172/1609	3.95	4.16	4.22	4.30	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	1	6	7	3.78	1032/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	9	6	3.89	1030/1535	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.18	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	8	6	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.43	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.19	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.85	4.69	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1104/1582	4.06	4.49	4.26	4.31	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	1090/1575	4.11	4.48	4.27	4.35	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	8	8	4.17	567/1380	4.17	4.41	3.94	4.04	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.28	4.01	4.18	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1515	4.38	4.47	4.24	4.40	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 472 0101
 Title PRIN OF PHARMACOLOGY
 Instructor: STAIR, RANDY G.
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 687
 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	1	9	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.50	4.27	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	907/1585	3.90	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.03	4.08	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.43	4.18	4.23	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1311/1673	4.40	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.19	4.07	4.19	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.89	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.49	4.26	4.31	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.48	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	131/1380	4.78	4.41	3.94	4.04	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.28	4.01	4.18	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.47	4.24	4.40	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	4.19	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

Course-Section: EHS 475 0101
 Title RESP & CRIT ILL PATIEN
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 688
 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	0	11	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1674	4.73	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	636/1423	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	369/1585	4.45	3.69	3.96	4.01	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	832/1535	4.09	4.03	4.08	4.18	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	169/1651	4.82	4.43	4.18	4.23	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.19	4.07	4.19	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	560/1586	4.73	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	481/1582	4.64	4.49	4.26	4.31	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	407/1575	4.73	4.48	4.27	4.35	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	220/1380	4.64	4.41	3.94	4.04	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	323/1520	4.63	4.28	4.01	4.18	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.40	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	74/ 265	4.60	4.60	4.23	4.53	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	188/ 278	4.00	4.00	4.19	4.21	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	137/ 260	4.50	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	148/ 259	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.31	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	118/ 233	4.25	4.25	4.20	4.10	4.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.15	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.31	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.57	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.08	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.27	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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