

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 919
 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	4	0	0	3	2	3	20	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.42	4.30	4.11	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	4	1	22	4.57	515/1576	4.57	4.39	4.27	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	3	22	4.59	500/1342	4.59	4.56	4.32	4.19	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	5	15	3.97	905/1465	3.97	4.25	4.12	4.02	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.29	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.55	4.19	4.10	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	1	25	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	783/1554	4.19	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	24	4.72	568/1488	4.72	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	1125/1493	4.61	4.75	4.73	4.65	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	2	6	15	4.28	506/1277	4.28	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	3	2	11	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.42	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.51	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	907/1269	4.11	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	9	1	2	0	1	6	3.90	557/ 878	3.90	4.20	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 2	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 920
 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	1	3	4	13	4.38	808/1576	4.38	4.42	4.30	4.35	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.56	4.32	4.41	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	792/1520	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	708/1465	4.19	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	758/1434	4.18	4.29	4.14	4.06	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.55	4.19	4.22	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	987/1574	4.62	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	2	0	2	11	3	3.72	1187/1554	3.72	4.04	4.10	4.05	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	484/1488	4.76	4.59	4.47	4.44	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	792/1486	4.42	4.47	4.32	4.29	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.31	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	438/1277	4.37	4.16	4.03	4.01	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	575/1279	4.38	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.51	4.35	4.30	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.63	4.35	4.29	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	4.20	4.05	3.92	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: CANHAM, RHONDA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 920
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 380 0101
 Title GLOBAL ISSUES IN HEALT
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 921
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	4	18	4.52	609/1576	4.52	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	420/1576	4.64	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	251/1342	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.30	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	837/1520	4.27	4.31	4.25	4.25	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	17	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	3	1	14	4.30	625/1434	4.30	4.29	4.14	4.15	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.55	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.77	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	892/1554	4.07	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	1064/1488	4.32	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	720/1486	4.48	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	6	1	13	4.14	1042/1489	4.14	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	480/1277	4.32	4.16	4.03	4.11	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.20	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.51	4.35	4.42	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.63	4.35	4.41	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.20	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 380 0101
 Title GLOBAL ISSUES IN HEALT
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 921
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 922
 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	8	18	4.69	373/1576	4.69	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	20	4.62	467/1342	4.62	4.56	4.32	4.46	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	731/1520	4.36	4.31	4.25	4.38	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	14	4.15	748/1465	4.15	4.25	4.12	4.22	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	625/1434	4.31	4.29	4.14	4.30	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	399/1547	4.62	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	586/1574	4.84	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	732/1554	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	21	4.76	484/1488	4.76	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.75	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.47	4.32	4.41	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	364/1489	4.76	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	2	18	4.48	328/1277	4.48	4.16	4.03	4.04	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	400/1279	4.58	4.42	4.17	4.31	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	435/1270	4.74	4.51	4.35	4.53	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	409/1269	4.79	4.63	4.35	4.55	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	1	3	1	9	3.88	570/ 878	3.88	4.20	4.05	4.33	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 922
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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 411 0101
 Title HEALTH REGUL & QUAL IM
 Instructor: SNYDER, ANNETTE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 923
 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	1	0	2	2	0	1	7	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.42	4.30	4.46	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1503/1576	3.17	4.39	4.27	4.35	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	941/1342	4.09	4.56	4.32	4.46	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	5	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.31	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.25	4.12	4.22	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	625/1434	4.30	4.29	4.14	4.30	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	971/1547	4.10	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	1048/1574	4.55	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1405/1554	3.20	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1307/1488	3.92	4.59	4.47	4.55	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1403/1493	4.08	4.75	4.73	4.80	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.47	4.32	4.41	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1070/1489	4.09	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	1001/1277	3.55	4.16	4.03	4.04	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	910/1279	3.88	4.42	4.17	4.31	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.51	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.63	4.35	4.55	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.20	4.05	4.33	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101
 Title HEALTH REGUL & QUAL IM
 Instructor: SNYDER, ANNETTE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 923
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 412 0101
 Title RES METHODS IN HEALTH
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 924
 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	4	7	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	333/1342	4.73	4.56	4.32	4.46	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	665/1520	4.42	4.31	4.25	4.38	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.25	4.12	4.22	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.75	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	489/1277	4.30	4.16	4.03	4.04	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1279	4.88	4.42	4.17	4.31	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.51	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.63	4.35	4.55	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	125/ 878	4.83	4.20	4.05	4.33	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HAPP 498 0101
 Title FIN MGMT FOR HLTH SER
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 925
 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	2	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	364/1576	4.68	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	381/1342	4.68	4.56	4.32	4.46	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	410/1465	4.48	4.25	4.12	4.22	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	330/1434	4.59	4.29	4.14	4.30	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	179/1547	4.82	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	720/1574	4.77	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	379/1554	4.53	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	248/1488	4.90	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.75	4.73	4.80	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.47	4.32	4.41	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	309/1489	4.81	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	850/1277	3.81	4.16	4.03	4.04	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	413/1279	4.55	4.42	4.17	4.31	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.51	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.63	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	3	2	3	10	4.11	440/ 878	4.11	4.20	4.05	4.33	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 498 0101
 Title FIN MGMT FOR HLTH SER
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 925
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	19				
				?	0						