

Course-Section: EHS 200 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER  
 Instructor: KRUMPERMAN, KUR  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 630  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	7	7	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	827/1342	4.27	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.31	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	768/1465	4.13	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	852/1434	4.07	4.35	4.14	4.06	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	827/1547	4.27	4.46	4.19	4.22	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.69	4.64	4.62	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.70	4.47	4.44	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.76	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1489	4.47	4.62	4.32	4.31	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	293/1277	4.53	4.67	4.03	4.01	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	419/1279	4.55	4.76	4.17	4.14	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	447/1270	4.73	4.84	4.35	4.30	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	479/1269	4.73	4.85	4.35	4.29	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.70	4.05	3.92	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 15 Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	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: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 631  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	1	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	825/1576	4.36	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	4	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	945/1488	4.44	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1366/1493	4.22	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	637/1489	4.56	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	4.76	4.17	4.20	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.70	4.05	4.09	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	68/ 85	4.44	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.44
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	66/ 80	4.25	4.25	4.61	4.22	4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	164/ 375	4.40	4.40	4.01	4.12	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 15	Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101  
 Title MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 632  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.76	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.70	4.05	4.09	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.48	4.37	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	27/ 48	4.50	4.60	4.40	3.92	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	35/ 44	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.63	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	36/ 45	4.25	4.50	4.57	4.50	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 326	4.75	4.72	4.03	4.23	4.75	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
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	1

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101  
 Title MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 633  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	4.83	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.83	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	4.67	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	4.50	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.76	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.70	4.05	4.09	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.48	4.37	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	27/ 48	4.50	4.60	4.40	3.92	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	35/ 44	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.63	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	36/ 45	4.25	4.50	4.57	4.50	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 326	4.75	4.72	4.03	4.23	4.75	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 350 0101  
 Title SUPERVISION:EHS SYSTEM  
 Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 634  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	910/1576	4.29	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	181/1277	4.71	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.70	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.72	4.03	4.23	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 351 0101  
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:E  
 Instructor: KRUMPERMAN, KUR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 635  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	500/1576	4.60	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	454/1465	4.44	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	4.78	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.09	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 636  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	3	0	3	2	4	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.60	4.30	4.30	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	1336/1520	3.58	4.56	4.25	4.25	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	4	4	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1057/1434	3.82	4.35	4.14	4.15	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1289/1547	3.64	4.46	4.19	4.21	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1428/1554	3.11	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	1278/1493	4.42	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	1184/1489	3.92	4.62	4.32	4.34	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.76	4.17	4.20	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: EHS 474 0101  
 Title INTRO TO MED EMERGENCI  
 Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 637  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.56	4.25	4.38	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1434	4.86	4.35	4.14	4.30	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.70	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.62	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.67	4.03	4.04	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.85	4.35	4.55	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	129/ 878	4.80	4.70	4.05	4.33	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.40	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EHS 481 0101  
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 638  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	1	5	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.60	4.30	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.56	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.22	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.35	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.70	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.76	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.62	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.67	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.76	4.17	4.31	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 52	4.80	4.95	4.48	4.70	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	31/ 48	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.30	4.40	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 44	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.60	4.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.34	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	149/ 326	4.40	4.72	4.03	3.97	4.40	

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

Course-Section: EHS 483 0101  
 Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 639  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.60	4.30	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.35	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.70	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.62	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	4.67	4.03	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.48	4.70	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.60	4.40	4.30	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.60	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.50	4.57	4.34	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.72	4.03	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EHS 492 0101  
 Title SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I  
 Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 640  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.60	4.30	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.35	4.14	4.30	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.70	4.47	4.55	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.76	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.62	4.32	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	4.67	4.03	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.40	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.70	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.72	4.03	3.97	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 6
				? 3	

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