

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 917
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	440/1670	4.70	3.97	4.31	4.23	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	428/1666	4.65	3.84	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	295/1406	4.78	3.87	4.32	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	874/1615	4.25	3.83	4.24	4.17	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	632/1566	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.03	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	590/1528	4.38	3.74	4.12	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	429/1650	4.60	3.99	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	616/1626	4.35	3.77	4.11	4.07	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.06	4.46	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	622/1549	4.55	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.02	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	1	9	6	4.06	674/1323	4.06	3.77	4.00	3.91	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	384/1384	4.58	4.19	4.10	3.92	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.12	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	867/1378	4.25	4.27	4.31	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.69	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 918
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	589/1670	4.57	3.97	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	582/1666	4.54	3.84	4.27	4.27	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	775/1406	4.36	3.87	4.32	4.39	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	972/1615	4.17	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	589/1566	4.31	3.94	4.07	4.00	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1217/1528	3.64	3.74	4.12	4.11	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	246/1650	4.79	3.99	4.22	4.20	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	3.77	4.11	4.06	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	371/1559	4.85	4.06	4.46	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.92	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	586/1549	4.58	3.89	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	619/1546	4.58	4.02	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	597/1323	4.18	3.77	4.00	4.08	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	348/1384	4.64	4.19	4.10	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.91	4.12	4.29	4.25	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.27	4.31	4.26	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 15	Non-major 8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 919
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	388/1670	4.73	3.97	4.31	4.45	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	490/1666	4.60	3.84	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	261/1406	4.80	3.87	4.32	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	245/1615	4.80	3.83	4.24	4.37	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	0	13	4.47	429/1566	4.47	3.94	4.07	4.17	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	560/1528	4.40	3.74	4.12	4.26	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	289/1650	4.73	3.99	4.22	4.28	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	483/1626	4.45	3.77	4.11	4.28	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	555/1559	4.73	4.06	4.46	4.58	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	488/1549	4.67	3.89	4.31	4.43	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546	4.87	4.02	4.32	4.43	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	273/1323	4.60	3.77	4.00	4.10	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	152/1384	4.92	4.19	4.10	4.32	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	218/1378	4.92	4.12	4.29	4.55	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.69	4.03	4.22	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 919
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101
 Title HEALTH PLANNING & REGU
 Instructor: SNYDER, ANNETTE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 920
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	8	3	4	5	0	2.30	1659/1670	2.30	3.97	4.31	4.45	2.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	9	6	3	1	1	1.95	1663/1666	1.95	3.84	4.27	4.35	1.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	3	6	5	2	0	2.38	1396/1406	2.38	3.87	4.32	4.48	2.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	7	6	4	0	2.72	1600/1615	2.72	3.83	4.24	4.37	2.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	3	6	6	1	3.18	1437/1566	3.18	3.94	4.07	4.17	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	6	5	2	2	2.67	1502/1528	2.67	3.74	4.12	4.26	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	7	3	5	2	2	2.42	1628/1650	2.42	3.99	4.22	4.28	2.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1104/1667	4.58	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	5	6	3	1	0	2.00	1612/1626	2.00	3.77	4.11	4.28	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	1	6	7	1	3.11	1514/1559	3.11	4.06	4.46	4.58	3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	3	3	3	7	3.42	1532/1560	3.42	4.55	4.72	4.80	3.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	5	5	1	1	2.29	1531/1549	2.29	3.89	4.31	4.43	2.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	3	3	6	2	1	2.67	1517/1546	2.67	4.02	4.32	4.43	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1259/1323	2.67	3.77	4.00	4.10	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	4.19	4.10	4.32	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	1	0	3	2	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	4.12	4.29	4.55	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	0	2	3	1	2.89	1322/1378	2.89	4.27	4.31	4.60	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	865/ 904	2.50	3.69	4.03	4.22	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	3						

Course-Section: HAPP 412 0101
 Title RES METHODS IN HEALTH
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 921
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	3	3	8	8	3.83	1400/1670	3.83	3.97	4.31	4.45	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	7	8	3.96	1258/1666	3.96	3.84	4.27	4.35	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	9	9	4.04	1033/1406	4.04	3.87	4.32	4.48	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	962/1615	4.17	3.83	4.24	4.37	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	675/1566	4.23	3.94	4.07	4.17	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	421/1528	4.50	3.74	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	4	6	7	3.76	1353/1650	3.76	3.99	4.22	4.28	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	14	6	4.18	1416/1667	4.18	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	915/1626	4.08	3.77	4.11	4.28	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	4	3	5	9	3.77	1403/1559	3.77	4.06	4.46	4.58	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	5	3	10	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	3.89	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	1	5	11	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.02	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	403/1323	4.43	3.77	4.00	4.10	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	560/1384	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.32	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	740/1378	4.38	4.12	4.29	4.55	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	428/1378	4.77	4.27	4.31	4.60	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.22	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 25	Non-major 9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	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 16		
				? 2			

Course-Section: HAPP 452 0101
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY A
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 922
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1486/1670	3.67	3.97	4.31	4.45	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1564/1666	3.33	3.84	4.27	4.35	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1375/1406	2.89	3.87	4.32	4.48	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	0	1	2.88	1589/1615	2.88	3.83	4.24	4.37	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1419/1566	3.22	3.94	4.07	4.17	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1485/1528	2.83	3.74	4.12	4.26	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	3.99	4.22	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1480/1626	3.29	3.77	4.11	4.28	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1518/1559	3.00	4.06	4.46	4.58	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1376/1560	4.33	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1465/1549	3.22	3.89	4.31	4.43	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	0	2	3.22	1448/1546	3.22	4.02	4.32	4.43	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1254/1323	2.71	3.77	4.00	4.10	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1057/1384	3.60	4.19	4.10	4.32	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1275/1378	3.20	4.12	4.29	4.55	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1086/1378	3.80	4.27	4.31	4.60	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.69	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HAPP 498 0101
 Title Finan Mgmt & Decis Supp for HSO
 Instructor: Coakley, P.
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 15
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	281/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	190/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	205/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	2	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	263/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	6	23	4.55	369/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	315/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	201/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	239/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	1	29	4.84	257/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	265/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	7	3	0	3	5	13	4.04	677/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	169/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	122/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	281/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	22	11	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 43	Non-major 22
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 27		
				? 1			