

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	2	0	4	13	20	4.26	899/1522	4.26	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	28	4.54	511/1522	4.54	4.31	4.26	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	28	4.46	578/1285	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.36	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	3	9	21	4.28	769/1476	4.28	4.08	4.22	4.20	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	0	5	6	19	4.06	728/1412	4.06	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	2	9	4	17	3.86	977/1381	3.86	4.00	4.08	3.97	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	232/1500	4.74	4.32	4.18	4.20	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	16	4.42	1144/1517	4.42	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	8	21	6	3.89	1049/1497	3.89	4.01	4.11	4.11	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	31	4.76	452/1440	4.76	4.57	4.45	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	32	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.77	4.71	4.78	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	27	4.59	490/1436	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	3	6	25	4.35	802/1432	4.35	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	4	3	25	4.31	430/1221	4.31	4.33	3.93	4.02	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	1	5	3	7	3.53	1022/1280	3.53	4.19	4.10	4.08	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	3	2	3	9	3.74	1072/1277	3.74	4.48	4.34	4.33	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	3	4	3	8	3.74	1041/1269	3.74	4.38	4.31	4.33	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	10	4	0	2	1	2	2.67	****/ 854	****	4.45	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.83	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.60	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	4.59	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 45	****	4.09	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.09	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 14	Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 0	Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 30
				P 1	Electives 3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	21
?	3		

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 605
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	4.82	239/1522	4.82	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	193/1522	4.82	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1285	4.91	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	671/1476	4.36	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	185/1412	4.73	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	693/1381	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	242/1500	4.73	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	901/1517	4.70	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.82	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	161/1432	4.91	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	442/1221	4.29	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.83	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	39/ 47	3.80	4.59	4.41	4.56	3.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.09	4.30	4.39	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 606
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.25	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1412	****	4.00	4.06	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	392/1381	4.44	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1500	4.89	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.33	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.45	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/ 79	4.83	4.83	4.58	4.53	4.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	46/ 78	4.60	4.60	4.45	4.34	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.33	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.59	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.09	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.09	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 311 0101
 Title STRESS/BURNOUT EMER PE
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 607
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	6	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	702/1522	4.40	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	434/1381	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	387/1500	4.60	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.89	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	175/1221	4.67	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.71	4.36	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101
 Title MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 608
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	14	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.20	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	386/1285	4.64	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	100/1476	4.93	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	411/1412	4.43	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	556/1381	4.31	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	275/1500	4.69	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	104/1497	4.91	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	394/1432	4.71	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	187/1221	4.64	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.13	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	16/ 45	4.71	4.09	4.30	4.39	4.71	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	3.53	4.40	4.68	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.09	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	21/ 34	4.25	3.76	4.30	4.12	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	12	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General	11	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				? 0						

Course-Section: EHS 350 0101
 Title SUPERVISION:EHS SYSTEM
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 609
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	693/1381	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1112/1440	4.17	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	957/1436	4.17	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	949/1432	4.17	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	524/1221	4.17	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 351 0101
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:E
 Instructor: DEAN, STEPHEN F
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 610
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	7	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	383/1522	4.64	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	337/1285	4.69	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	444/1476	4.54	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	715/1412	4.07	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	357/1436	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	478/1432	4.64	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	373/1221	4.38	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	442/1280	4.44	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	560/1277	4.56	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	157/ 854	4.63	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 611
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.20	4.30	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.25	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	680/1412	4.13	4.00	4.06	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.32	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.01	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.22	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	144/1221	4.71	4.33	3.93	3.94	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	644/1280	4.17	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	174/ 854	4.57	4.45	4.02	4.00	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.71	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.86	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	3.57	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.83	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.60	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.59	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.09	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.53	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.09	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.76	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 611
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 400 0101
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE
 Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 612
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.20	4.30	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.88	4.31	4.26	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.08	4.22	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	457/1412	4.38	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1381	4.86	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.57	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	457/1436	4.63	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	343/1221	4.43	4.33	3.93	4.04	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.45	4.02	4.31	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	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	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 476 0101
 Title INTRO TRAUMA EMERGENCI
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 613
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	3	1	3.30	1456/1522	3.30	4.20	4.30	4.42	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1231/1285	3.22	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1446/1476	2.78	4.08	4.22	4.31	2.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1296/1412	3.22	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1219/1500	3.70	4.32	4.18	4.25	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	2.90	1438/1497	3.55	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	3	1	3.10	1402/1440	3.80	4.57	4.45	4.52	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1407/1448	4.10	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1373/1436	3.55	4.29	4.29	4.32	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	3.10	1355/1432	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.34	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	933/1221	3.89	4.33	3.93	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.48	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	569/ 854	3.80	4.45	4.02	4.31	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	190/ 215	3.71	3.71	4.36	4.47	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	205/ 217	3.86	3.86	4.51	4.55	3.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	193/ 216	3.57	3.57	4.42	4.20	3.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	185/ 205	3.50	3.50	4.23	3.85	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	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	0	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		
			? 0	Other	10

Course-Section: EHS 476 0101
 Title INTRO TRAUMA EMERGENCI
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 614
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	3	1	3.30	1456/1522	3.30	4.20	4.30	4.42	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1231/1285	3.22	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1446/1476	2.78	4.08	4.22	4.31	2.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1296/1412	3.22	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1219/1500	3.70	4.32	4.18	4.25	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	718/1497	3.55	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	3.80	4.57	4.45	4.52	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1448	4.10	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	3.55	4.29	4.29	4.32	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.34	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	408/1221	3.89	4.33	3.93	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.48	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	569/ 854	3.80	4.45	4.02	4.31	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	190/ 215	3.71	3.71	4.36	4.47	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	205/ 217	3.86	3.86	4.51	4.55	3.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	193/ 216	3.57	3.57	4.42	4.20	3.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	185/ 205	3.50	3.50	4.23	3.85	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	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	0	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	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 477 0101
 Title SPECIAL POPULATIONS
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 615
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	3	7	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.20	4.30	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1101/1285	3.73	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.08	4.22	4.31	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	973/1412	3.80	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	938/1381	3.91	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	444/1500	4.55	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1307/1517	4.18	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	544/1497	4.36	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1440	4.64	4.57	4.45	4.52	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.82	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	762/1436	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	695/1432	4.45	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	500/1221	4.20	4.33	3.93	4.04	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.19	4.10	4.28	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.83	4.45	4.02	4.31	4.83	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 481 0101
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 616
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	3	5	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.20	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1290/1522	3.70	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.25	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1198/1476	3.75	4.08	4.22	4.31	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1412	****	4.00	4.06	4.11	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	4	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	1422/1500	3.10	4.32	4.18	4.25	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	5	2	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1345/1440	3.60	4.57	4.45	4.52	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.77	4.71	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1197/1436	3.80	4.29	4.29	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1344/1432	3.20	4.22	4.29	4.34	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	4.33	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.28	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.49	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.45	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.71	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	****	3.86	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 216	****	3.57	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	3.85	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	33/ 47	4.13	4.59	4.41	4.51	4.13	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	44/ 45	2.75	4.09	4.30	4.22	2.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	33/ 39	3.63	3.53	4.40	4.03	3.63	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	28/ 35	3.88	4.09	4.31	4.13	3.88	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	31/ 34	3.29	3.76	4.30	4.11	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EHS 483 0101
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 617
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.20	4.30	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.08	4.22	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.32	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.57	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.33	3.93	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.19	4.10	4.28	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.45	4.02	4.31	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.09	4.30	4.22	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	35/ 39	3.00	3.53	4.40	4.03	3.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.09	4.31	4.13	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 34	4.00	3.76	4.30	4.11	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 492 0101
 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 618
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	1	0	2.67	1505/1522	2.67	4.20	4.30	4.42	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1419/1522	3.33	4.31	4.26	4.34	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1248/1285	3.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1456/1476	2.67	4.08	4.22	4.31	2.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1350/1381	2.50	4.00	4.08	4.21	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.32	4.18	4.25	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.57	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.77	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1419/1436	2.50	4.29	4.29	4.32	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1402/1432	2.50	4.22	4.29	4.34	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.33	3.93	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.19	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.45	4.02	4.31	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	40/ 45	3.00	4.09	4.30	4.22	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	39/ 39	2.50	3.53	4.40	4.03	2.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	30/ 35	3.50	4.09	4.31	4.13	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	27/ 34	3.50	3.76	4.30	4.11	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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