

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	0	3	8	11	4.36	761/1447	4.36	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	13	4.32	792/1447	4.32	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	460/1241	4.59	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	976/1402	4.00	3.99	4.24	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	7	13	4.36	496/1358	4.36	4.01	4.11	4.12	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	968/1316	3.81	3.94	4.14	4.08	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	265/1427	4.68	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	938/1447	4.68	4.82	4.69	4.70	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	657/1434	4.24	4.34	4.10	3.97	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	398/1387	4.77	4.70	4.46	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	958/1387	4.68	4.76	4.73	4.71	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	568/1386	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	709/1380	4.45	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	818/1172	3.88	4.33	4.15	4.12	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	774/1182	4.19	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	725/1170	4.31	4.42	4.38	4.32	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	5	0	2	1	5	3.08	739/ 800	3.08	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.33	4.34	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	4.33	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.17	4.48	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.50	4.33	4.46	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.74	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.40	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.88	4.30	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.00	4.43	****	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****	

Course-Section: EHS 200 01
 Title Concepts Emer Hlth Ser
 Instructor: Krumperman, Kurt
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 554
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 311 01
 Title Stress/Burnout Emer Pe
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 555
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	4	4.57	507/1447	4.57	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.48	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	854/1402	4.17	3.99	4.24	4.24	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1050/1358	3.71	4.01	4.11	4.10	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	549/1316	4.33	3.94	4.14	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	568/1427	4.43	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	4.80	4.16	4.02	4.05	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1182	4.25	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	763/1170	4.25	4.42	4.38	4.49	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.05	4.06	4.12	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.33	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.33	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.74	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.40	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.47	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.88	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: EHS 311 01
 Title Stress/Burnout Emer Pe
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 555
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 330 01
 Title Management: Search/Resc
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 556
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	1	12	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	590/1447	4.47	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	177/1241	4.87	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	787/1402	4.23	3.99	4.24	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	563/1358	4.31	4.01	4.11	4.10	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	768/1316	4.08	3.94	4.14	4.13	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	120/1427	4.86	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	290/1434	4.58	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	366/1380	4.73	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	168/1193	4.69	4.16	4.02	4.05	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	619/1172	4.20	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	624/1170	4.44	4.42	4.38	4.49	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	228/ 800	4.44	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.44
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 38	4.86	4.74	4.49	4.73	4.86
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	13/ 36	4.71	4.40	4.25	3.81	4.71
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	22/ 28	4.33	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	20/ 30	4.17	3.88	4.30	4.42	4.17
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.43	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 350 01
 Title Supervision:EHS System
 Instructor: Walz,Bruce J
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 557
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	6	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	401/1447	4.63	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	494/1402	4.50	3.99	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1358	4.63	4.01	4.11	4.10	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	274/1316	4.63	3.94	4.14	4.13	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1036/1447	4.57	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.09	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.76	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	593/1193	4.13	4.16	4.02	4.05	4.13

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.33	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.42	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	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		
				? 1			

Course-Section: EHS 351 01
 Title Financial Management:E
 Instructor: Krumperman,Kurt
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 558
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	6	4	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	836/1402	4.18	3.99	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	608/1358	4.25	4.01	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	768/1316	4.08	3.94	4.14	4.13	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	582/1427	4.42	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	784/1386	4.36	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	367/1193	4.42	4.16	4.02	4.05	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	637/1172	4.17	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	788/1182	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	816/1170	4.17	4.42	4.38	4.49	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	1	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EHS 360 01
 Title Instruct Issues In EHS
 Instructor: Mitchell,Jeffre (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 559
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	6	3	2	3.64	1300/1447	3.64	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	728/1447	4.36	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1241	****	4.48	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1188/1402	3.70	3.99	4.24	4.24	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	6	1	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	4.01	4.11	4.10	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1014/1316	3.73	3.94	4.14	4.13	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	1176/1427	3.73	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.78	4.76	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	691/1386	4.44	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	615/1380	4.55	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	440/1193	3.82	4.16	4.02	4.05	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.42	4.38	4.49	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.05	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: EHS 360 01
 Title Instruct Issues In EHS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 560
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	6	3	2	3.64	1300/1447	3.64	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	728/1447	4.36	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1241	****	4.48	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1188/1402	3.70	3.99	4.24	4.24	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	6	1	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	4.01	4.11	4.10	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1014/1316	3.73	3.94	4.14	4.13	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	1176/1427	3.73	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1434	4.20	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	4.80	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	4.78	4.76	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1386	4.44	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	4.55	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1022/1193	3.82	4.16	4.02	4.05	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.42	4.38	4.49	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.05	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			Non-major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 1			

Course-Section: EHS 474 01
 Title Intro To Med Emergenci
 Instructor: Polk,Dwight A
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 561
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	5	12	4.71	364/1447	4.71	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	814/1447	4.29	4.40	4.27	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.48	4.33	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	4	3.88	1088/1402	3.88	3.99	4.24	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	7	3.71	1057/1358	3.71	4.01	4.11	4.15	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	8	2	3.59	1097/1316	3.59	3.94	4.14	4.27	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1034/1427	3.94	4.25	4.19	4.20	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.82	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	765/1434	4.13	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	322/1387	4.82	4.70	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	732/1387	4.82	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	895/1386	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	571/1380	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	8	5	3.94	726/1193	3.94	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	566/1172	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.25	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	527/1182	4.55	4.50	4.35	4.49	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	751/1170	4.27	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.05	4.06	4.19	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	4.74	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	4.40	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	4.47	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	3.88	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 3
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	
					Electives 0
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EHS 476 01
 Title Intro Trauma Emergenci
 Instructor: Williams JR,Gar
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 562
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	8	7	4.24	889/1447	4.24	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	741/1447	4.35	4.40	4.27	4.31	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	896/1241	4.06	4.48	4.33	4.41	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	976/1402	4.00	3.99	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	9	4	3.76	1015/1358	3.76	4.01	4.11	4.15	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	7	3	3.64	1063/1316	3.64	3.94	4.14	4.27	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	361/1427	4.59	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.82	4.69	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1045/1434	3.82	4.34	4.10	4.17	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	1055/1387	4.24	4.70	4.46	4.48	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1125/1387	4.53	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	997/1386	4.12	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	952/1380	4.18	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	780/1193	3.87	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.33	4.15	4.25	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.05	4.06	4.19	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	113/ 189	4.33	4.33	4.34	4.74	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	122/ 192	4.33	4.33	4.34	4.61	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	154/ 186	4.17	4.17	4.48	4.72	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	98/ 187	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.59	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

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	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	364/1447	4.71	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	814/1447	4.29	4.40	4.27	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1241	****	4.48	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1264/1402	3.50	3.99	4.24	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	997/1316	3.75	3.94	4.14	4.27	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1252/1427	3.53	4.25	4.19	4.20	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1118/1387	4.14	4.70	4.46	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1289/1387	4.17	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1160/1386	3.83	4.43	4.32	4.34	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	971/1380	4.14	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1193	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.33	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	788/1182	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.49	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	816/1170	4.17	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.05	4.06	4.19	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.33	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.33	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.17	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.50	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	22/ 38	4.62	4.74	4.49	4.68	4.62
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	23/ 36	4.08	4.40	4.25	4.42	4.08
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	16/ 28	4.62	4.47	4.52	4.72	4.62
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	26/ 30	3.58	3.88	4.30	4.38	3.58
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	2	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	22/ 27	4.00	4.00	4.43	4.62	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			