

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 586
 JUN 13, 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	1	3	2	8	13	4.07	1024/1481	4.07	4.54	4.29	4.40	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	779/1481	4.30	4.55	4.23	4.29	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	9	6	10	3.96	1010/1424	3.96	4.43	4.21	4.28	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	7	14	4.22	527/1396	4.22	4.27	3.98	3.94	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	1	6	5	10	3.72	1005/1342	3.72	4.31	4.07	4.05	3.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	6	15	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	12	4.41	1114/1480	4.41	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	3	14	3	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.40	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.75	4.42	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.80	4.69	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	12	13	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.69	4.26	4.29	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	11	12	4.27	859/1400	4.27	4.67	4.27	4.34	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	2	4	16	4.38	359/1179	4.38	4.36	3.96	4.05	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	761/1262	3.94	4.40	4.05	4.11	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	944/1259	3.94	4.55	4.29	4.34	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	880/1256	4.06	4.48	4.30	4.28	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	540/ 788	3.73	4.33	4.00	3.98	3.73	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 28 Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 587
 JUN 13, 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	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.54	4.29	4.29	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	446/1481	4.56	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	586/1249	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	12	4.47	330/1396	4.47	4.27	3.98	4.00	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	713/1342	4.07	4.31	4.07	4.12	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	491/1480	4.94	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.40	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	319/1409	4.81	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	350/1407	4.93	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	203/1399	4.81	4.69	4.26	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	3	3	6	3.79	773/1179	3.79	4.36	3.96	4.02	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	150/1262	4.85	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	347/1259	4.77	4.55	4.29	4.34	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	345/1256	4.77	4.48	4.30	4.34	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 587
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 588
 JUN 13, 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	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.54	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.43	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.27	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.31	4.07	4.12	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.67	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.40	4.09	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	323/1179	4.43	4.36	3.96	4.02	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.55	4.29	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	809/1256	4.20	4.48	4.30	4.34	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.70	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.66	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	3.92	4.43	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 588
 JUN 13, 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 311 0101
 Title STRESS/BURNOUT EMER PE
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 589
 JUN 13, 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	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.54	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	264/1481	4.71	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	248/1424	4.71	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	839/1396	3.86	4.27	3.98	4.00	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.31	4.07	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.40	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.69	4.26	4.27	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	223/1179	4.57	4.36	3.96	4.02	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.55	4.29	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.48	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.33	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	4	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 345 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: SMITH-CUMBERLAN
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 590
 JUN 13, 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	1	4	11	15	4.29	792/1481	4.29	4.54	4.29	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	14	4.19	884/1481	4.19	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	10	12	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	9	15	4.03	943/1424	4.03	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	8	9	10	3.71	959/1396	3.71	4.27	3.98	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	6	16	4.10	701/1342	4.10	4.31	4.07	4.12	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	7	18	4.32	707/1459	4.32	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	2	5	10	8	3.74	1107/1450	3.74	4.40	4.09	4.10	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	603/1409	4.63	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	26	4.74	842/1407	4.74	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	11	16	4.35	733/1399	4.35	4.69	4.26	4.27	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	9	17	4.29	836/1400	4.29	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	299/1179	4.45	4.36	3.96	4.02	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	8	9	10	3.86	823/1262	3.86	4.40	4.05	4.14	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	5	5	18	4.34	722/1259	4.34	4.55	4.29	4.34	4.34	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	4	6	17	4.24	779/1256	4.24	4.48	4.30	4.34	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	17	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.33	4.00	4.07	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: EHS 345 0101
 Title DEATH AND DYING
 Instructor: SMITH-CUMBERLAN
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 590
 JUN 13, 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	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	13	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 350 0101
 Title SUPERVISION:EHS SYSTEM
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 591
 JUN 13, 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	0	4	11	4.73	316/1481	4.73	4.54	4.29	4.29	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	219/1249	4.79	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	302/1424	4.64	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	209/1396	4.64	4.27	3.98	4.00	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	206/1342	4.64	4.31	4.07	4.12	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1011/1480	4.57	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.40	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	150/1409	4.92	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	103/1399	4.92	4.69	4.26	4.27	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1400	4.92	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	404/1179	4.31	4.36	3.96	4.02	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	190/1262	4.78	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	336/1259	4.78	4.55	4.29	4.34	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.48	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	105/ 788	4.75	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 351 0101
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:E
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 592
 JUN 13, 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	2	2	13	4.65	417/1481	4.65	4.54	4.29	4.29	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	219/1481	4.76	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	154/1249	4.88	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1424	4.81	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	209/1396	4.65	4.27	3.98	4.00	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	158/1342	4.71	4.31	4.07	4.12	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	113/1459	4.88	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	966/1480	4.65	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	174/1450	4.73	4.40	4.09	4.10	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	400/1409	4.77	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	930/1407	4.69	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.69	4.26	4.27	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1400	4.85	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	518/1179	4.15	4.36	3.96	4.02	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	190/1262	4.78	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	336/1259	4.78	4.55	4.29	4.34	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.48	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 476 0101
 Title INTRO TRAUMA EMERGENCI
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 593
 JUN 13, 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.55	4.23	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.27	3.98	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.31	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.67	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.40	4.09	4.28	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.40	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 477 0101
 Title SPECIAL POPULATIONS
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 594
 JUN 13, 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	1	2	7	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.54	4.29	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.55	4.23	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	980/1249	3.90	4.43	4.27	4.44	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	908/1424	4.10	4.43	4.21	4.35	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.27	3.98	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.31	4.07	4.21	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.67	4.16	4.25	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.40	4.09	4.28	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.75	4.42	4.51	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.80	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	783/1399	4.30	4.69	4.26	4.36	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	385/1400	4.70	4.67	4.27	4.38	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.36	3.96	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.40	4.05	4.33	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.55	4.29	4.57	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.48	4.30	4.60	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	650/ 788	3.40	4.33	4.00	4.26	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	

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	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 478 0101
 Title FIELD OPERATIONS IN EM
 Instructor: STRAIGHT, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 595
 JUN 13, 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	2	5	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.54	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	950/1481	4.11	4.55	4.23	4.32	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.43	4.21	4.35	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1114/1396	3.44	4.27	3.98	4.09	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	934/1342	3.83	4.31	4.07	4.21	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	550/1459	4.44	4.67	4.16	4.25	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	761/1450	4.13	4.40	4.09	4.28	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.75	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.78	4.80	4.69	4.79	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.69	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.67	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	177/1179	4.67	4.36	3.96	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.40	4.05	4.33	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.55	4.29	4.57	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.48	4.30	4.60	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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