

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 816
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	5	7	15	4.17	981/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	357/1503	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	21	4.52	497/1290	4.52	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	705/1453	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	5	5	8	3.14	1279/1421	3.14	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1128/1365	3.56	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	23	4.55	402/1485	4.55	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	9	11	3	3.67	1170/1483	3.67	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	1089/1426	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	604/1418	4.48	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	3	21	4.52	613/1416	4.52	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	4	3	6	9	3.78	805/1199	3.78	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	956/1312	3.65	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	898/1303	4.06	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	810/1299	4.24	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	29	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	11				
				?	3						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 817
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	6	25	4.64	386/1504	4.64	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	24	4.64	346/1503	4.64	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	24	4.64	378/1290	4.64	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	3	7	15	4.03	725/1421	4.03	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	2	5	1	8	3.94	866/1365	3.94	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	26	4.64	319/1485	4.64	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	24	4	3.94	1441/1504	3.94	4.68	4.69	4.68	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	433/1483	4.43	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	5	24	4.48	807/1425	4.48	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	31	4.85	643/1426	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	2	25	4.48	604/1418	4.48	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	27	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	2	1	7	15	4.04	625/1199	4.04	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	2	12	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	630/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	494/1299	4.61	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	33	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 818
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	429/1504	4.59	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	572/1503	4.45	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	681/1290	4.36	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	594/1453	4.41	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	863/1421	3.90	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	370/1365	4.45	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	960/1504	4.70	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	624/1483	4.27	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	618/1425	4.64	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	596/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	420/1416	4.68	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	283/1312	4.63	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	493/ 758	3.82	4.05	4.01	4.17	3.82
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	3.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.37	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Min	Max	Count	Category	Count	Level	Count	Level	Count	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101
 Title HEALTH PLANNING & REGU
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 819
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	368/1503	4.61	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	280/1290	4.72	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	532/1453	4.44	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	459/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	407/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	139/1485	4.82	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	209/1425	4.88	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	995/1426	4.65	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	331/1418	4.71	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	232/1416	4.82	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	201/1199	4.63	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.63

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	503/ 758	3.78	4.05	4.01	4.17	3.78

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	7	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 498 0101
 Title FIN MGMT/DEC SUP HSO
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 820
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	13	4.87	161/1504	4.87	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	92/1290	4.93	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	81/1453	4.93	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	72/1421	4.93	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	69/1365	4.93	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	68/1485	4.93	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	84/1483	4.90	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	580/1199	4.13	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.17	5.00

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						