

Course-Section: HAPP 100 1
 Title Survey US Hlth Care Sy
 Instructor: Riley,Joyce L
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 858
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	0	0	0	5	5	21	4.52	586/1509	4.52	4.49	4.31	4.18	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	4	4	21	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.53	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	2	0	5	1	12	4.05	945/1459	4.05	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	6	4	17	4.21	647/1406	4.21	4.20	4.09	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	1	1	4	1	11	4.11	742/1384	4.11	4.22	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	5	22	4.48	485/1489	4.48	4.58	4.17	4.20	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.41	4.09	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	363/1438	4.81	4.70	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	1	6	22	4.48	1173/1421	4.48	4.84	4.73	4.66	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	482/1411	4.61	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	23	4.58	558/1405	4.58	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	3	8	17	4.38	383/1236	4.38	4.29	4.00	3.87	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	574/1260	4.32	4.49	4.14	3.95	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	561/1255	4.53	4.50	4.33	4.15	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	700/1258	4.42	4.79	4.38	4.18	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	2	0	3	1	9	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.59	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: HAPP 100 1
 Title Survey US Hlth Care Sy
 Instructor: Riley, Joyce L
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 858
 MAR 22, 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	22	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 1
 Title Hmn Dev Impl Hlth/Dise
 Instructor: Canham,Rhonda L
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 859
 MAR 22, 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	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.49	4.31	4.34	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	621/1509	4.45	4.53	4.26	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	500/1287	4.52	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	7	9	3.91	934/1406	3.91	4.20	4.09	4.09	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	1063/1384	3.74	4.22	4.11	4.09	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	3	17	4.59	352/1489	4.59	4.58	4.17	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.41	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.70	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.95	4.84	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.57	4.31	4.37	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.60	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	1	2	14	4.30	451/1236	4.30	4.29	4.00	4.11	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	3	9	4.21	653/1260	4.21	4.49	4.14	4.19	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	883/1255	4.07	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.79	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.59	4.03	4.04	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****

Course-Section: HAPP 200 1
 Title Hmn Dev Impl Hlth/Dise
 Instructor: Canham,Rhonda L
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 859
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 380 1
 Title Global Issues In Healt
 Instructor: Jeffrey, Jeanett
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 860
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	9	13	4.46	661/1509	4.46	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	11	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.53	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	13	4.38	668/1287	4.38	4.61	4.30	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	711/1406	4.13	4.20	4.09	4.12	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	527/1489	4.46	4.58	4.17	4.14	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	917/1506	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	367/1463	4.47	4.41	4.09	4.08	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	9	5	8	3.83	1291/1438	3.83	4.70	4.46	4.43	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.84	4.73	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	902/1411	4.24	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	974/1405	4.14	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	402/1236	4.35	4.29	4.00	4.07	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	520/1260	4.38	4.49	4.14	4.22	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	611/1255	4.46	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	486/1258	4.69	4.79	4.38	4.42	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	350/ 873	4.22	3.59	4.03	4.08	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: HAPP 380 1
 Title Global Issues In Healt
 Instructor: Jeffrey, Jeanett
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 860
 MAR 22, 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	14	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 402 1
 Title Envrmntl Hlth Pol & Pr
 Instructor: Keenan Jr,Paul
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 861
 MAR 22, 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	0	0	5	21	4.81	244/1509	4.81	4.49	4.31	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	133/1509	4.88	4.53	4.26	4.26	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	143/1287	4.88	4.61	4.30	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	209/1459	4.73	4.43	4.22	4.32	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	4	15	4.25	587/1406	4.25	4.20	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	243/1384	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.23	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	73/1489	4.92	4.58	4.17	4.18	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	933/1506	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	57/1463	4.94	4.41	4.09	4.18	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.70	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.60	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	100/1236	4.81	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.49	4.14	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1255	4.92	4.50	4.33	4.46	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.79	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	3.59	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****

Course-Section: HAPP 402 1
 Title Envrmntl Hlth Pol & Pr
 Instructor: Keenan Jr,Paul
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 861
 MAR 22, 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	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	12	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 412 1
 Title Res Methods In Health
 Instructor: Kalfoglou,Andre
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 862
 MAR 22, 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	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1044/1509	4.10	4.49	4.31	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1020/1509	4.09	4.53	4.26	4.26	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.61	4.30	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	917/1459	4.09	4.43	4.22	4.32	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	934/1406	3.90	4.20	4.09	4.11	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1009/1384	3.82	4.22	4.11	4.23	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	923/1489	4.09	4.58	4.17	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1006/1463	3.88	4.41	4.09	4.18	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1438	4.64	4.70	4.46	4.50	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.91	4.84	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	867/1411	4.27	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	947/1405	4.18	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	824/1236	3.80	4.29	4.00	4.03	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	558/1260	4.33	4.49	4.14	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.50	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.79	4.38	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	845/ 873	2.75	3.59	4.03	4.26	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
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	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: HAPP 497 1
 Title Hlth Plng & Admin
 Instructor: Coakley, Paul E
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 863
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	1	2	16	4.79	267/1509	4.79	4.49	4.31	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.53	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	101/1459	4.89	4.43	4.22	4.32	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	121/1406	4.83	4.20	4.09	4.11	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	165/1384	4.74	4.22	4.11	4.23	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	55/1489	4.95	4.58	4.17	4.18	4.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1098/1506	4.47	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.41	4.09	4.18	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.70	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	148/1411	4.89	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.60	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	598/1236	4.13	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	157/1260	4.88	4.49	4.14	4.25	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.79	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.59	4.03	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	15	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	1				
				? 0						