

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101  
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI  
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 641  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	206/1670	4.90	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	997/1406	4.10	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	910/1615	4.22	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1413/1528	3.20	4.26	4.12	4.07	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1278/1650	3.90	4.46	4.22	4.12	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.19	4.11	4.06	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.72	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.58	4.31	4.25	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	253/1546	4.89	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	648/1323	4.11	4.39	4.00	3.99	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	289/ 904	4.40	4.51	4.03	4.03	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.50	4.21	3.99	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.76	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.97	4.50	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.19	3.96	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.49	4.62	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.45	4.27	4.38	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****	

Course-Section: EHS 302 0101  
 Title CLINCL CONCEPTS/PRACTI  
 Instructor: FAYER, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 641  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT  
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 642  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	4.14	4.07	4.04	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.26	4.12	4.07	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	239/1626	4.71	4.19	4.11	4.06	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.72	4.72	4.67	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.58	4.31	4.25	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	522/1323	4.29	4.39	4.00	3.99	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	894/1378	4.20	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.51	4.03	4.03	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	56/ 87	4.75	4.88	4.65	4.30	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	62/ 79	4.33	3.67	4.64	4.53	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	45/ 79	4.50	4.58	4.45	3.68	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	25/ 80	4.60	3.97	3.97	3.76	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5 Under-grad 11 Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

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

Course-Section: EHS 311 0101  
 Title STRESS/BURNOUT EMER PE  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 643  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.26	4.12	4.07	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.19	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.60	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.72	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.58	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.39	4.00	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.60	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.58	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.51	4.03	4.03	5.00

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				? 0						

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	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	535/1406	4.56	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	423/1615	4.63	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	1	8	4.07	859/1528	4.07	4.26	4.12	4.07	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	485/1650	4.56	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1626	4.79	4.19	4.11	4.06	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.94	4.72	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.58	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	643/1546	4.56	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.39	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1378	4.58	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	156/ 904	4.73	4.51	4.03	4.03	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	16/ 41	4.93	4.97	4.50	4.44	4.93
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	15/ 38	4.73	4.55	4.19	3.96	4.73
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/ 38	4.92	4.49	4.62	4.68	4.92
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	10/ 39	4.92	4.45	4.27	4.38	4.92
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.51	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

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	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 10	Under-grad 16	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	1			

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	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	535/1406	4.56	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	423/1615	4.63	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	1	8	4.07	859/1528	4.07	4.26	4.12	4.07	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	485/1650	4.56	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.79	4.19	4.11	4.06	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	4.81	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	4.94	4.72	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	4.75	4.58	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	4.56	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	4.50	4.39	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1378	4.58	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	156/ 904	4.73	4.51	4.03	4.03	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	16/ 41	4.93	4.97	4.50	4.44	4.93
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	15/ 38	4.73	4.55	4.19	3.96	4.73
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/ 38	4.92	4.49	4.62	4.68	4.92
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	10/ 39	4.92	4.45	4.27	4.38	4.92
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.51	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

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	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 10	Under-grad 16	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	1			



Course-Section: EHS 350 0101  
 Title SUPERVISION:EHS SYSTEM  
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 646  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	932/1406	4.18	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	4.14	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1140/1528	3.78	4.26	4.12	4.07	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.46	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.70	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1220/1626	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.06	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1062/1559	4.36	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1354/1560	4.36	4.72	4.72	4.67	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	749/1549	4.45	4.58	4.31	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	971/1546	4.27	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.39	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	356/1384	4.63	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1378	4.38	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	580/ 904	3.88	4.51	4.03	4.03	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.76	****

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	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	4.46	4.31	4.24	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.36	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	6	0	3.33	1512/1615	3.33	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	2	6	0	2.83	1520/1566	2.83	4.14	4.07	4.04	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	3	1	3.08	1441/1528	3.08	4.26	4.12	4.07	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	6	2	3.42	1498/1650	3.42	4.46	4.22	4.12	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	2	2	3	1	2.58	1590/1626	2.58	4.19	4.11	4.06	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	4	3	2	0	2.60	1537/1559	2.60	4.60	4.46	4.40	2.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1543/1560	3.20	4.72	4.72	4.67	3.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1489/1549	3.00	4.58	4.31	4.25	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1509/1546	2.78	4.49	4.32	4.24	2.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1114/1323	3.29	4.39	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.63	4.60	4.10	4.12	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	860/1378	4.25	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1110/1378	3.75	4.65	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	4.51	4.03	4.03	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.76	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

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	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Major 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	10

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

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 648  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615	4.88	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	330/1528	4.63	4.26	4.12	4.07	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.06	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.60	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.72	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.58	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.39	4.00	3.99	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	390/1384	4.57	4.60	4.10	4.12	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	548/1378	4.57	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	608/1378	4.57	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.51	4.03	4.03	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.30	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	3.68	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.76	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 1						

Course-Section: EHS 400 0101  
 Title EHS THEORY & PRACTICE  
 Instructor: ASHWORTH, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 649  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	621/1670	4.55	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	569/1666	4.55	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	459/1406	4.64	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	849/1615	4.27	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	621/1566	4.27	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	760/1528	4.20	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1623/1667	3.82	4.68	4.67	4.73	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.19	4.11	4.28	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.72	4.72	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	451/1549	4.70	4.58	4.31	4.43	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	917/1323	3.75	4.39	4.00	4.10	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1384	4.14	4.60	4.10	4.32	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	842/1378	4.29	4.58	4.29	4.55	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	731/1378	4.43	4.65	4.31	4.60	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	794/ 904	3.25	4.51	4.03	4.22	3.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.80	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	9	
			? 0			

Course-Section: EHS 474 0101  
 Title INTRO TO MED EMERGENCI  
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 650  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	208/1650	4.83	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.19	4.11	4.28	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.60	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.72	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.58	4.31	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.39	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.60	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.58	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.51	4.03	4.22	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.50	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.50	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.88	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.58	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.97	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/ 38	4.50	4.55	4.19	4.36	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 38	4.50	4.49	4.62	4.58	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 39	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.02	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	16/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.47	4.49	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	6	
?	1			

Course-Section: EHS 478 0101  
 Title FIELD OPERATIONS IN EM  
 Instructor: STRAIGHT, KEVIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 651  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.72	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.58	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1323	4.90	4.39	4.00	4.10	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.60	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.58	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.51	4.03	4.22	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.97	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.49	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.45	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 478 0101  
 Title FIELD OPERATIONS IN EM  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 652  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1626	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.90	4.39	4.00	4.10	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.60	4.10	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.58	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.51	4.03	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.97	4.50	4.98	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.49	4.62	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.45	4.27	4.02	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EHS 481 0101  
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 653  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1276/1615	3.83	4.42	4.24	4.37	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.60	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.72	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.58	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.39	4.00	4.10	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1384	****	4.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.58	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.65	4.31	4.60	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	85/ 239	4.50	4.50	4.21	4.26	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.24	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	78/ 218	4.50	4.50	4.18	4.09	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.97	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	29/ 38	3.80	4.55	4.19	4.36	3.80
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	24/ 38	4.60	4.49	4.62	4.58	4.60
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	19/ 39	4.40	4.45	4.27	4.02	4.40
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	16/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.47	4.49	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 483 0101  
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 654  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.14	4.07	4.17	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.60	4.46	4.58	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.72	4.72	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.58	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.49	4.32	4.43	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.39	4.00	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.97	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.55	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	37/ 38	3.50	4.49	4.62	4.58	3.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	33/ 39	3.50	4.45	4.27	4.02	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	30/ 31	3.50	4.50	4.47	4.49	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 492 0101  
 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 655  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1383/1666	3.80	4.36	4.27	4.35	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.37	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.14	4.07	4.17	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.46	4.22	4.28	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1254/1626	3.75	4.19	4.11	4.28	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.72	4.72	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.58	4.31	4.43	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.39	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.60	4.10	4.32	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.58	4.29	4.55	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.65	4.31	4.60	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.88	4.65	4.80	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	77/ 79	3.00	3.67	4.64	4.60	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	53/ 75	4.33	4.33	4.57	4.56	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 79	4.67	4.58	4.45	4.53	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	63/ 80	3.33	3.97	3.97	3.67	3.33	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	5				
				?	0						