```
Course Section: SOWK 200  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1543
Title          SOC ISSUES SOC ACTION             Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    MOELLER, DITTE                      Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  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    3   0  1  0  0  0  11  4.67   389/1669  4.67   4.50  4.23  4.34  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  1  1  10  4.75   243/1666  4.75   4.57  4.19  4.29  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   136/1421  4.92   4.68  4.24  4.35  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0  0  0  0  4   8  4.67   323/1617  4.67   4.57  4.15  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  1  4   7  4.50   340/1555  4.50   4.27  4.00  3.96  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  1  1  2   8  4.42   503/1543  4.42   4.46  4.06  4.10  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  1  2   9  4.67   302/1647  4.67   4.60  4.12  4.19  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  7   5  4.42  1265/1668  4.42   4.76  4.67  4.59  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  0  1   8  4.89   107/1605  4.89   4.36  4.07  4.15  4.89


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  0  0  1  10  4.91   189/1514  4.91   4.64  4.39  4.39  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00     1/1551  5.00   4.79  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  1  1   9  4.73   312/1503  4.73   4.60  4.24  4.29  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  0  0  1  0  10  4.82   273/1506  4.82   4.63  4.26  4.33  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  1  0  0  2   8  4.45   298/1311  4.45   4.19  3.85  3.96  4.45


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  1  0  0  10  4.73   289/1490  4.73   4.50  4.05  4.11  4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  1  0  10  4.82   326/1502  4.82   4.61  4.26  4.31  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00     1/1489  5.00   4.65  4.29  4.36  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   2  0  0  1  1   7  4.67   178/1006  4.67   4.28  4.00  3.99  4.67

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 1  0  0  0   0  1.00  ****/ 233  ****   ****  4.19  4.36  ****


             Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0  1  1  0  0   0  1.50  ****/  52  ****   ****  4.06  5.00  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2       0.00-0.99    0       A   8      Required for Majors   4    Graduate      0      Major          3
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0       B   3                                                    
 56-83      4       2.00-2.99    3       C   0      General               6    Under-grad   15      Non-major     12
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49    3       D   0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    1       F   1      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                 1
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 240  0201              University of Maryland                        Page 1544
Title         INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO         Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BAFFOUR, TIFFAN                   Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 20                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                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   7  0  2  3  2  1  5  3.31 1550/1669  4.12  4.50  4.23  4.34  3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7  0  0  2  3  1  7  4.00 1094/1666  4.46  4.57  4.19  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7  7  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  557/1421  4.88  4.68  4.24  4.35  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7  1  1  0  2  3  6  4.08  981/1617  4.46  4.57  4.15  4.24  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7 5  3  0  0  0  5  3.50 1227/1555  3.60  4.27  4.00  3.96  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 0 5 2 5  3.77 1130/1543  4.33  4.46  4.06  4.10  3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            7  0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  356/1647  4.61  4.60  4.12  4.19  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7  0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62 1115/1668  4.84  4.76  4.67  4.59  4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2 0 0 3 2 3  4.00  918/1605  4.05  4.36  4.07  4.15  4.00

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9  0  1  1  1  4  4  3.82 1303/1514  4.36  4.64  4.39  4.39  3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  11  0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22 1350/1551  4.66  4.79  4.66  4.72  4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 1 0 2 3 3  3.78 1225/1503  4.42  4.60  4.24  4.29  3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    11  0  1  1  0  3  4  3.89 1184/1506  4.46  4.63  4.26  4.33  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 1 2 0 1 3 3  3.56  914/1311  4.33  4.19  3.85  3.96  3.56

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 2 1 4 2  3.40 1215/1490  3.97  4.50  4.05  4.11  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 2 4 4  4.20  920/1502  4.27  4.61  4.26  4.31  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 2 0 3 2 3  3.40 1318/1489  4.22  4.65  4.29  4.36  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  6  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/1006  4.55  4.28  4.00  3.99  ****

               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3          0.00-0.99  1      A   10       Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0        Major       10
28-55     1          1.00-1.99  0      B    2
56-83     3          2.00-2.99  2      C    0       General              0      Under-grad  20        Non-major   10
84-150    0          3.00-3.49  3      D    0
Grad.     0          3.50-4.00  1      F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               12
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 240  0601          University of Maryland                          Page 1545
Title     INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO        Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    BAFFOUR, TIFFAN          Fall   2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 18                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                        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   4   6   6  4.13 1077/1669  4.12  4.50  4.23  4.34  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   2   3   4   7  4.00 1094/1666  4.46  4.57  4.19  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  10   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1421   4.88  4.68  4.24  4.35  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   3   0   1   5   1   6  3.92 1140/1617  4.46  4.57  4.15  4.24  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1   3   2   0   5   5  3.47 1257/1555  3.60  4.27  4.00  3.96  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2  0   0   4   4   6  4.14  783/1543  4.33  4.46  4.06  4.10  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67  302/1647  4.61  4.60  4.12  4.19  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94  499/1668  4.84  4.76  4.67  4.59  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0  0   1   7   1  4.00  918/1605  4.05  4.36  4.07  4.15  4.00


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   4   5   7  4.19 1124/1514  4.36  4.64  4.39  4.39  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   2   2  12  4.63 1083/1551  4.66  4.79  4.66  4.72  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   1   0   9   6  4.25  879/1503  4.42  4.60  4.24  4.29  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   0   0   7   8  4.31  858/1506  4.46  4.63  4.26  4.33  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  2   1   3   3   7  3.75  791/1311  4.33  4.19  3.85  3.96  3.75


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   2   0   4   3   6  3.73 1049/1490  3.97  4.50  4.05  4.11  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   6   6   3  3.80 1179/1502  4.27  4.61  4.26  4.31  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   2   1   5   7  4.13  993/1489  4.22  4.65  4.29  4.36  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   6   0   0   2   3   4  4.22  393/1006  4.55  4.28  4.00  3.99  4.22

          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 1 0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 233   ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 112   ****  4.60  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  97   ****  4.67  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  4.83  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 105   ****  4.83  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  98   ****  4.83  3.95  4.20  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  58   ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  39   ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  40   ****  ****  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  30   ****  ****  4.33  5.00  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  55   ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  42   ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  46   ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  33   ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  29   ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: SOWK 240  8020            University of Maryland                         Page 1546
Title       INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO         Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MORRIS, KATHERI                  Fall   2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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   3   0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20  988/1669  4.12  4.50  4.23  4.34  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1666  4.46  4.57  4.19  4.29  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   2   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1421  4.88  4.68  4.24  4.35  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1617  4.46  4.57  4.15  4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  1   0   0   1   1   2  4.25  558/1555  3.60  4.27  4.00  3.96  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  0   0   1   1   3  4.40  516/1543  4.33  4.46  4.06  4.10  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50  481/1647  4.61  4.60  4.12  4.19  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  901/1668  4.84  4.76  4.67  4.59  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   0   3   0  4.00  918/1605  4.05  4.36  4.07  4.15  4.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  679/1514  4.36  4.64  4.39  4.39  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  788/1551  4.66  4.79  4.66  4.72  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  220/1503  4.42  4.60  4.24  4.29  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  286/1506  4.46  4.63  4.26  4.33  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1311  4.33  4.19  3.85  3.96  5.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25  692/1490  3.97  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  393/1502  4.27  4.61  4.26  4.31  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   1   0   3  4.50  684/1489  4.22  4.65  4.29  4.36  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  178/1006  4.55  4.28  4.00  3.99  4.67


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: SOWK 240  8021           University of Maryland                                    Page 1547
Title        INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO      Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MORRIS, KATHERI             Fall  2006                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   10
Questionnaires:  6                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  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   1   5  4.83  183/1669  4.12  4.50  4.23  4.34  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  157/1666  4.46  4.57  4.19  4.29  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1421  4.88  4.68  4.24  4.35  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  146/1617  4.46  4.57  4.15  4.24  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   1   1   0   2  3.20 1383/1555  3.60  4.27  4.00  3.96  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1543  4.33  4.46  4.06  4.10  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67  302/1647  4.61  4.60  4.12  4.19  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1668  4.84  4.76  4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0   0   0   4   1  4.20  759/1605  4.05  4.36  4.07  4.15  4.20

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  308/1514  4.36  4.64  4.39  4.39  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1551  4.66  4.79  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  191/1503  4.42  4.60  4.24  4.29  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  249/1506  4.46  4.63  4.26  4.33  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1311  4.33  4.19  3.85  3.96  5.00

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0   0   1   1   4  4.50  445/1490  3.97  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0   1   0   1   4  4.33  818/1502  4.27  4.61  4.26  4.31  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0   0   0   1   5  4.83  348/1489  4.22  4.65  4.29  4.36  4.83
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  143/1006  4.55  4.28  4.00  3.99  4.75

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.71  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15  4.59  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.60  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.67  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.83  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.83  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.83  3.95  4.20  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  5.00  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: SOWK 260  0101          University of Maryland                                Page 1548
Title        INTRO SOCIAL WORK I         Baltimore County                                     JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BAFFOUR, TIFFAN            Fall  2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 39                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 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  10  0  0  0  3  3  23  4.69  360/1669  4.57  4.50  4.23  4.34  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   10  0  0  0  2  5  22  4.69  332/1666  4.58  4.57  4.19  4.29  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10  0  1  1  2  2  23  4.55  511/1421  4.62  4.68  4.24  4.35  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10  0  0  0  3  5  21  4.62  370/1617  4.60  4.57  4.15  4.24  4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  2  5  2  19  4.36  477/1555  4.44  4.27  4.00  3.96  4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  3  6  20  4.59  316/1543  4.45  4.46  4.06  4.10  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10  0  0  0  4  1  24  4.69  281/1647  4.66  4.60  4.12  4.19  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                 11  0  0  0  0  9  19  4.68 1058/1668  4.88  4.76  4.67  4.59  4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 19  0  0  0  4  9  7  4.15  800/1605  4.32  4.36  4.07  4.15  4.15


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       12  0  0  0  1  9  17  4.59  691/1514  4.68  4.64  4.39  4.39  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  12  0  0  0  1  2  24  4.85  650/1551  4.80  4.79  4.66  4.72  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0  0  0  2  6  19  4.63  438/1503  4.61  4.60  4.24  4.29  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12  0  0  0  2  7  18  4.59  556/1506  4.64  4.63  4.26  4.33  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13  0  2  0  1  6  17  4.38  349/1311  4.32  4.19  3.85  3.96  4.38


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  1  3  17  4.76  251/1490  4.53  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  0  0  2  3  16  4.67  486/1502  4.66  4.61  4.26  4.31  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18  0  1  0  2  2  16  4.52  666/1489  4.60  4.65  4.29  4.36  4.52
4. Were special techniques successful                 18  3  1  1  1  6  9  4.17  424/1006  3.90  4.28  4.00  3.99  4.17


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 38  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 38  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          38  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.71  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      5      0.00-0.99   0     A   18      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major       14
28-55      3      1.00-1.99   0     B    7
56-83      5      2.00-2.99   2     C    1      General              2    Under-grad   39     Non-major   25
84-150     1      3.00-3.49   6     D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2     F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P    0                               responses to be significant
                                    I    0      Other               21
                                    ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 260  0201            University of Maryland                                  Page 1549
Title        INTRO SOCIAL WORK I          Baltimore County                                       JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  WALSH, KATHLEEN              Fall  2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires: 37                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
    Questions                      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   6  0  1  0  0  5 25  4.71  331/1669  4.57  4.50 4.23 4.34 4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7  0  0  0  0  2 28  4.93   72/1666  4.58  4.57 4.19 4.29 4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8  0  0  0  0  0 29  5.00    1/1421  4.62  4.68 4.24 4.35 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7  0  0  0  2  3 25  4.77  207/1617  4.60  4.57 4.15 4.24 4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  4 25  4.80  141/1555  4.44  4.27 4.00 3.96 4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 0  0  0  7 23  4.77  172/1543  4.45  4.46 4.06 4.10 4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            7  0  0  0  0  2 28  4.93   78/1647  4.66  4.60 4.12 4.19 4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7  0  0  0  0  1 29  4.97  285/1668  4.88  4.76 4.67 4.59 4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0  0  7 19  4.73  182/1605  4.32  4.36 4.07 4.15 4.73

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7  0  0  0  0  1 29  4.97   76/1514  4.68  4.64 4.39 4.39 4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7  0  0  0  0  0 30  5.00    1/1551  4.80  4.79 4.66 4.72 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0  0  0  2 28  4.93   88/1503  4.61  4.60 4.24 4.29 4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7  0  0  0  0  1 29  4.97   66/1506  4.64  4.63 4.26 4.33 4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 1 1 0  1  3 25  4.70  174/1311  4.32  4.19 3.85 3.96 4.70

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1  0  0  6 22  4.66  348/1490  4.53  4.50 4.05 4.11 4.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0  0  0  3 25  4.89  246/1502  4.66  4.61 4.26 4.31 4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0  0  1 27  4.96  112/1489  4.60  4.65 4.29 4.36 4.96
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  5  3  0  3  6 11  3.96  543/1006  3.90  4.28 4.00 3.99 3.96

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  34  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  **** **** 4.20 4.42 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34 0 1 0 0  0  2  3.67 ****/ 233  **** **** 4.19 4.36 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 223  **** **** 4.35 4.71 ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  **** 4.60 4.38 4.59 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 1 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  **** 4.67 4.36 4.60 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  **** 4.83 4.22 4.50 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    35  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  **** 4.83 4.20 4.63 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                35  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  **** 4.83 3.95 4.20 ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  58  **** **** 4.22 4.20 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  **** **** 4.06 5.00 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  39  **** **** 4.39 5.00 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  30  **** **** 4.33 5.00 ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  55  **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  42  **** **** 4.31 5.00 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       36  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  33  **** **** 4.25 5.00 ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: SOWK 260  8020                  University of Maryland                                 Page 1550
Title      INTRO SOCIAL WORK I                   Baltimore County                                     JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    STAFF                              Fall   2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 17                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	840/1669	4.57	4.50	4.23	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	1028/1666	4.58	4.57	4.19	4.29	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	0	12	4.29	781/1421	4.62	4.68	4.24	4.35	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	641/1617	4.60	4.57	4.15	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	633/1555	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.96	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	9	4.00	895/1543	4.45	4.46	4.06	4.10	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	728/1647	4.66	4.60	4.12	4.19	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.76	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	857/1605	4.32	4.36	4.07	4.15	4.09

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	0	13	4.47	845/1514	4.68	4.64	4.39	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	0	12	4.53	1168/1551	4.80	4.79	4.66	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	870/1503	4.61	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	799/1506	4.64	4.63	4.26	4.33	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	1	2	9	3.88	718/1311	4.32	4.19	3.85	3.96	3.88

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	756/1490	4.53	4.50	4.05	4.11	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	741/1502	4.66	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	883/1489	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.36	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	1	6	4	4	3.56	741/1006	3.90	4.28	4.00	3.99	3.56

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****

Seminar

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.60	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.67	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.83	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.83	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.83	3.95	4.20	****

Field Work

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****

Self Paced

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Questionnaires: 17   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   5   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   12
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   7
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   0   Under-grad   17   Non-major   5
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   1   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P   0   responses to be significant
                                              I   0   Other   10
                                              ?   0

```
Course Section: SOWK 360  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1551
Title          SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I         Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    TICE, CAROLYN                  Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      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  0  1  11  4.92   115/1669  4.91  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83   157/1666  4.82  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   136/1421  4.86  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  1  0  0  0  2   9  4.82   156/1617  4.81  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0  0  1  3   8  4.58   277/1555  4.69  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0  0  3   9  4.75   180/1543  4.68  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   100/1647  4.86  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  0  0  0  0  8   4  4.33  1329/1668  4.62  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 0 0  3   7  4.70   210/1605  4.60  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.70


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00     1/1514  4.93  4.64  4.39  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00     1/1551  4.98  4.79  4.66  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0  0  0  12  5.00     1/1503  4.98  4.60  4.24  4.28  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   147/1506  4.91  4.63  4.26  4.30  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 0  0  4   5  4.56   241/1311  4.54  4.19  3.85  3.97  4.56


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0  0  0  10  5.00     1/1490  4.95  4.50  4.05  4.11  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0  0  0  10  5.00     1/1502  4.93  4.61  4.26  4.28  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0  0  10  5.00     1/1489  4.95  4.65  4.29  4.35  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  1  0  1  0  2   6  4.44   278/1006  4.40  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.44


                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A   7      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0     Major       4
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0      B   4
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99   2      C   0      General              1    Under-grad  14     Non-major  10
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49   3      D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                               responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               10
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 360  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1552
Title        SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I          Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  WALSH, KATHLEEN                 Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 29                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 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   9   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  128/1669  4.91  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  181/1666  4.82  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   9   0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  217/1421  4.86  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    9   0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  161/1617  4.81  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  141/1555  4.69  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 0  0   1   0   5  14  4.60  298/1543  4.68  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9   0   0   0   1   2  17  4.80  167/1647  4.86  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  713/1668  4.62  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0  1  0   0   3  10  4.50  373/1605  4.60  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  274/1514  4.93  4.64  4.39  4.46  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95  307/1551  4.98  4.79  4.66  4.70  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95   76/1503  4.98  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  164/1506  4.91  4.63  4.26  4.30  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 0  0  1   1   3  12  4.53  255/1311  4.54  4.19  3.85  3.97  4.53


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  141/1490  4.95  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  286/1502  4.93  4.61  4.26  4.28  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0   0   0   2  18  4.90  280/1489  4.95  4.65  4.29  4.35  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   3   1   1   1   2  12  4.35  333/1006  4.40  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.35


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0       A   12       Required for Majors   0    Graduate      1     Major       18
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    2                                                       
  56-83      7      2.00-2.99   4       C    1       General               1    Under-grad   28     Non-major   11
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49   4       D    0                                                       
  Grad.      1      3.50-4.00   3       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                13
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 372  8020            University of Maryland                              Page 1553
Title        SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR        Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MCFEATERS, SUSA               Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              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  0  2  9  4.82  199/1669  4.82  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0  0  0  1 10  4.91  103/1666  4.91  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0  0  0  1 10  4.91  151/1421  4.91  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0   0  0  0  2  8  4.80  161/1617  4.80  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70  207/1555  4.70  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 5   0  0  1  0  4  4.60  298/1543  4.60  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  112/1647  4.90  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0  0  0  1  8  4.89  107/1605  4.89  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.89


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0  0  0  1 10  4.91  189/1514  4.91  4.64  4.39  4.46  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.79  4.66  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0  0  0  1 10  4.91  126/1503  4.91  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.63  4.26  4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0   0  0  0  1 10  4.91   79/1311  4.91  4.19  3.85  3.97  4.91


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0  0  0  2  7  4.78  242/1490  4.78  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  237/1502  4.90  4.61  4.26  4.28  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.65  4.29  4.35  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   2   0  0  0  3  5  4.63  192/1006  4.63  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.63


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.13  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7   1   0  0  0  2  3  4.60   56/ 112  4.60  4.60  4.38  4.53  4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7  0   0  0  0  2  4  4.67   45/  97  4.67  4.67  4.36  4.12  4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83   32/  92  4.83  4.83  4.22  4.47  4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     7   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83   32/ 105  4.83  4.83  4.20  4.45  4.83
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 7   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83   25/  98  4.83  4.83  3.95  4.15  4.83


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  11  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  3.49  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       11  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      11  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  4.13  ****
```

Title   SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSA   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: SOWK 387  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1554
Title         POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN           Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   SMELSER, PAMELA                  Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                  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  2 10  4.69  345/1669  4.69  4.50  4.23 4.28  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  319/1666  4.69  4.57  4.19 4.20  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46  607/1421  4.46  4.68  4.24 4.25  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  465/1617  4.54  4.57  4.15 4.22  4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1  0  1  4  3  4  3.83  996/1555  3.83  4.27  4.00 4.03  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0  5  8  4.62  290/1543  4.62  4.46  4.06 4.14  4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  270/1647  4.69  4.60  4.12 4.14  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  570/1668  4.92  4.76  4.67 4.68  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 1 3  7  4.33  591/1605  4.33  4.36  4.07 4.09  4.33

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  291/1514  4.85  4.64  4.39 4.46  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  409/1551  4.92  4.79  4.66 4.70  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0  2 11  4.85  182/1503  4.85  4.60  4.24 4.28  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  237/1506  4.85  4.63  4.26 4.30  4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 7  5  4.31  414/1311  4.31  4.19  3.85 3.97  4.31

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 1 3  7  4.33  622/1490  4.33  4.50  4.05 4.11  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 2 1  8  4.33  818/1502  4.33  4.61  4.26 4.28  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 5  7  4.58  613/1489  4.58  4.65  4.29 4.35  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   8  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  479/1006  4.00  4.28  4.00 4.10  4.00

                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19 4.13  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.60  4.38 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  97  ****  4.67  4.36 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.83  4.22 4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   14   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.83  4.20 4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               14   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.83  3.95 4.15  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0       A   8       Required for Majors  1    Graduate     1      Major       11
28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0       B   5
56-83     4       2.00-2.99   1       C   0       General              6    Under-grad  14      Non-major    4
84-150    3       3.00-3.49   4       D   0
Grad.     1       3.50-4.00   4       F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other                6
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 388  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1555
Title       HUMAN BEHAVIOR                    Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  OKUNDAYE, JOSHU                      Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  40                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	11	0	3	1	3	9	13	3.97	1219/1669	4.37	4.50	4.23	4.28	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	2	3	8	6	10	3.66	1395/1666	4.32	4.57	4.19	4.20	3.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	2	1	2	15	9	3.97	1005/1421	4.42	4.68	4.24	4.25	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	2	2	1	4	8	12	4.00	1029/1617	4.35	4.57	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	4	3	8	11	3.79	1037/1555	4.22	4.27	4.00	4.03	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	2	13	9	3.86	1060/1543	4.21	4.46	4.06	4.14	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	2	4	5	17	4.32	775/1647	4.52	4.60	4.12	4.14	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	1	0	0	1	26	4.82	863/1668	4.89	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	2	5	12	6	3.88	1108/1605	4.16	4.36	4.07	4.09	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	2	6	8	11	3.93	1255/1514	4.47	4.64	4.39	4.46	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	3	5	20	4.52	1184/1551	4.77	4.79	4.66	4.70	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	2	5	7	12	3.89	1172/1503	4.37	4.60	4.24	4.28	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	5	7	13	3.96	1111/1506	4.44	4.63	4.26	4.30	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	20	3	1	2	0	2	2.63	****/1311	4.18	4.19	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	1	10	8	3.87	974/1490	4.42	4.50	4.05	4.11	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	1	3	5	12	4.04	997/1502	4.42	4.61	4.26	4.28	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	3	4	13	4.09	1018/1489	4.57	4.65	4.29	4.35	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	17	10	2	2	0	5	4	3.54	750/1006	4.04	4.28	4.00	4.10	3.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.60	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.67	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.83	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.83	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.83	3.95	4.15	****

```
                                         Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	40	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: SOWK 388  0201                University of Maryland                            Page 1556
Title      HUMAN BEHAVIOR                        Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  WIECHELT, SHELL                      Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  18                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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  2  3 12  4.44  676/1669  4.37  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  8 10  4.56  494/1666  4.32  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0  0  1  2 14  4.76  267/1421  4.42  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  1  6 11  4.56  445/1617  4.35  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  0  4  3  9  4.31  508/1555  4.22  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  1  0  7 10  4.44  465/1543  4.21  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  0  3 15  4.83  150/1647  4.52  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  2 16  4.89  750/1668  4.89  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   0  0  2  7  7  4.31  617/1605  4.16  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.31

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  1  4 13  4.67  584/1514  4.47  4.64  4.39  4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  2 16  4.89  567/1551  4.77  4.79  4.66  4.70  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  1  5 12  4.61  451/1503  4.37  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  3  0 15  4.67  471/1506  4.44  4.63  4.26  4.30  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2   1  1  2  2  9  4.13  519/1311  4.18  4.19  3.85  3.97  4.13

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  4 14  4.78  242/1490  4.42  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0  0  2  3 13  4.61  531/1502  4.42  4.61  4.26  4.28  4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0  1  1  1 15  4.67  532/1489  4.57  4.65  4.29  4.35  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0   1  0  4  5  8  4.06  469/1006  4.04  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.06


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0       A    8       Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major      13
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   1       B    8
  56-83     5      2.00-2.99   2       C    1       General              2      Under-grad  18       Non-major   5
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49   1       D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   3       F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               15
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 388  8020                  University of Maryland                            Page 1557
Title       HUMAN BEHAVIOR                         Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   THIEL, MINDY                            Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 21                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  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  6  15  4.71  318/1669  4.37  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  5  16  4.76  231/1666  4.32  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  1  5  14  4.52  538/1421  4.42  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  1  0  1  4  14  4.50  496/1617  4.35  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  5  14  4.57  285/1555  4.22  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  1  4  3  13  4.33  580/1543  4.21  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  1  2  5  12  4.40  651/1647  4.52  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  1  20  4.95  357/1668  4.89  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  1 11  6  4.28  666/1605  4.16  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.28

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  1  2  17  4.80  360/1514  4.47  4.64  4.39  4.46  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  1  0  19  4.90  512/1551  4.77  4.79  4.66  4.70  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  1  3  15  4.60  464/1503  4.37  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  1  4  15  4.70  433/1506  4.44  4.63  4.26  4.30  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0  1  3  4   9  4.24  458/1311  4.18  4.19  3.85  3.97  4.24

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  2  4  14  4.60  389/1490  4.42  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  1  1  3  15  4.60  540/1502  4.42  4.61  4.26  4.28  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0  0  1  20  4.95  140/1489  4.57  4.65  4.29  4.35  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  0  0  0  3  4  14  4.52  227/1006  4.04  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.52

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  20 0 0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  58  **** ****  4.22  4.29  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: SOWK 389  0101              University of Maryland                             Page 1558
Title      HUMAN BEHAVIOR II                    Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  OKUNDAYE, JOSHU                      Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 24                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                 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   7   0  0  0  0  5  12  4.71  331/1669  4.61  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7   0  0  0  3  2  12  4.53  527/1666  4.60  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7   0  0  0  5  3   9  4.24  831/1421  4.43  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7   0  0  0  1  7   9  4.47  539/1617  4.49  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  6  10  4.53  324/1555  4.49  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 2 6  8  4.24  680/1543  4.44  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            8   0  0  1  1  2  12  4.56  412/1647  4.66  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  8   0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00    1/1668  4.53  4.76  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 1 2 3 8 4.29  654/1605  4.45  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.29


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  0  0  1  4  12  4.65  616/1514  4.70  4.64  4.39  4.46  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88  567/1551  4.82  4.79  4.66  4.70  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  1  0  4  12  4.59  482/1503  4.68  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0  0  1  4  0  12  4.35  819/1506  4.51  4.63  4.26  4.30  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 6 2 1 4 0  3  3.10 1104/1311  3.36  4.19  3.85  3.97  3.10


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 4 10  4.71  298/1490  4.68  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 3 11  4.79  358/1502  4.82  4.61  4.26  4.28  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 2 12  4.86  329/1489  4.83  4.65  4.29  4.35  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   4  1  0  3  0   6  4.00  479/1006  4.28  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.00


                                 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    5
  56-83       3     2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General               0     Under-grad   24     Non-major 10
  84-150      3     3.00-3.49    5      D    0
  Grad.       0     3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                13
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 389  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1559
Title       HUMAN BEHAVIOR II                 Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MOSES, JAMAAL                       Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  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   0   0   2   6  13  4.52  567/1669   4.61  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   2   3  16  4.67  359/1666   4.60  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   3   2  16  4.62  453/1421   4.43  4.68  4.24  4.25  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1   0   0   4   2  14  4.50  496/1617   4.49  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   1   0   3   1  15  4.45  398/1555   4.49  4.27  4.00  4.03  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   2   3  15  4.65  258/1543   4.44  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   2   1  17  4.75  213/1647   4.66  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0  19   1  4.05 1503/1668   4.53  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   0   0   1   5  12  4.61  288/1605   4.45  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.61


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   1   3  16  4.75  441/1514   4.70  4.64  4.39  4.46  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   1   3  17  4.76  862/1551   4.82  4.79  4.66  4.70  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   5  16  4.76  266/1503   4.68  4.60  4.24  4.28  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   2   3  16  4.67  471/1506   4.51  4.63  4.26  4.30  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13   1   0   3   1   3  3.63  875/1311   3.36  4.19  3.85  3.97  3.63


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   1   5  14  4.65  348/1490   4.68  4.50  4.05  4.11  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  286/1502   4.82  4.61  4.26  4.28  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  378/1489   4.83  4.65  4.29  4.35  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  11   1   0   0   0   8  4.56  217/1006   4.28  4.28  4.00  4.10  4.56


                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2       0.00-0.99    1       A   13      Required for Majors   0    Graduate    1     Major     18
  28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0       B    3
  56-83     3       2.00-2.99    5       C    1      General               2    Under-grad  21    Non-major  4
  84-150    3       3.00-3.49    3       D    0
  Grad.     1       3.50-4.00    3       F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                17
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 390F 0101          University of Maryland                        Page 1560
Title       ADVOCATES PROGRAM               Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  HARVEY, ALISON  (Instr. A)         Fall  2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  4                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   816/1669  4.33  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1666  5.00  4.57  4.19  4.20  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1421  5.00  4.68  4.24  4.25  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1617  5.00  4.57  4.15  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1555  5.00  4.27  4.00  4.03  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   250/1543  4.67  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1647  5.00  4.60  4.12  4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  1329/1668  4.33  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   239/1605  4.67  4.36  4.07  4.09  4.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1514  5.00  4.64  4.39  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1551  4.00  4.79  4.66  4.70  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1503  5.00  4.60  4.24  4.28  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1506  5.00  4.63  4.26  4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  1115/1311  3.00  4.19  3.85  3.97  3.00


                                       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       0
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B    0                                                          
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General              2      Under-grad   4        Non-major   4
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    1        D    0                                                          
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    1        F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 390F 0101            University of Maryland                      Page 1561
Title        ADVOCATES PROGRAM              Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)         Fall  2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  4                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               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  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   816/1669  4.33  4.50  4.23  4.28  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1666  5.00  4.57  4.19  4.20  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1421  5.00  4.68  4.24  4.25  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1617  5.00  4.57  4.15  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1555  5.00  4.27  4.00  4.03  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67   250/1543  4.67  4.46  4.06  4.14  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1647  5.00  4.60  4.12  4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  1329/1668  4.33  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.33


                                 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        0
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0         B    0                                                      
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99   0         C    0       General              2    Under-grad   4       Non-major    4
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49   1         D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   1         F    0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 395  0101              University of Maryland                                      Page 1562
Title       ALCOHOL PROBS/ALCHOLIS          Baltimore County                                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  DVORAK, MICHAEL                     Fall   2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:  25                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    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  11   0  0  0  1  3  10  4.64  419/1669  4.64 4.50  4.23 4.28  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   11   0  0  0  1  3  10  4.64  385/1666  4.64 4.57  4.19 4.20  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  11   0  0  1  0  3  10  4.57  493/1421  4.57 4.68  4.24 4.25  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   11   0  0  1  0  4   9  4.50  496/1617  4.50 4.57  4.15 4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  2  2   9  4.36  477/1555  4.36 4.27  4.00 4.03  4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  0  5  8  4.43  490/1543  4.43 4.46  4.06 4.14  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           11   0  0  1  0  3  10  4.57  401/1647  4.57 4.60  4.12 4.14  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 11   0  0  1  0  0  13  4.79  926/1668  4.79 4.76  4.67 4.68  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16  0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  448/1605  4.44 4.36  4.07 4.09  4.44

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       12   0  0  1  1  4   7  4.31 1052/1514  4.31 4.64  4.39 4.46  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  12   0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  409/1551  4.92 4.79  4.66 4.70  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0  0  0  1  2  10  4.69  347/1503  4.69 4.60  4.24 4.28  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12   0  0  0  1  3   9  4.62  534/1506  4.62 4.63  4.26 4.30  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12  0  0  1  1  2  9  4.46  291/1311  4.46 4.19  3.85 3.97  4.46

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  2  1  10  4.62  380/1490  4.62 4.50  4.05 4.11  4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  0  1  2  10  4.69  459/1502  4.69 4.61  4.26 4.28  4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  1  1  11  4.77  422/1489  4.77 4.65  4.29 4.35  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                 12   2  1  1  1  1   7  4.09  461/1006  4.09 4.28  4.00 4.10  4.09


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0       A    7         Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0      Major      10
   28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    6                                                       
   56-83     3       2.00-2.99    3       C    0         General              4    Under-grad  25      Non-major  15
   84-150    3       3.00-3.49    1       D    0
   Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    1       F    0         Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0         Other                8
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 397  0101          University of Maryland                        Page 1563
Title      SOCIAL WORK METHODS I         Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   KNIGHT, CAROLYN                 Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 10                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 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  2  8 4.80  207/1669 4.80 4.50 4.23 4.28 4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  1  8 4.70  319/1666 4.70 4.57 4.19 4.20 4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  8  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/1421 **** 4.68 4.24 4.25 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  9 4.90  114/1617 4.90 4.57 4.15 4.22 4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 2 5 4.20 611/1555 4.20 4.27 4.00 4.03 4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 390/1543 4.50 4.46 4.06 4.14 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  0  4  5 4.30  806/1647 4.30 4.60 4.12 4.14 4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 10 5.00    1/1668 5.00 4.76 4.67 4.68 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 157/1605 4.78 4.36 4.07 4.09 4.78

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1  2  7 4.60  679/1514 4.60 4.64 4.39 4.46 4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0 10 5.00    1/1551 5.00 4.79 4.66 4.70 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 0 8 4.60 464/1503 4.60 4.60 4.24 4.28 4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  1  9 4.90  164/1506 4.90 4.63 4.26 4.30 4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1311 **** 4.19 3.85 3.97 ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.44 512/1490 4.44 4.50 4.05 4.11 4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 486/1502 4.67 4.61 4.26 4.28 4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 411/1489 4.78 4.65 4.29 4.35 4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  0  0  1  0  2  6 4.44  278/1006 4.44 4.28 4.00 4.10 4.44
```

```
                               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    3
  56-83     2     2.00-2.99   2        C    1        General              0     Under-grad  10     Non-major  1
  84-150    1     3.00-3.49   2        D    0
  Grad.     0     3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                6
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 470  0101              University of Maryland                                     Page 1564
Title        SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH             Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BEMBRY, JAMES                    Fall  2006                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires: 26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
       Questions                        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   8   0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  306/1669  4.53  4.50  4.23 4.39  4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    8   0  0  0  2  7  9  4.39  715/1666  4.31  4.57  4.19 4.22  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8   0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  453/1421  4.33  4.68  4.24 4.38  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    8   0  0  0  1  6 11  4.56  445/1617  4.33  4.57  4.15 4.22  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  4  3 11  4.39  453/1555  4.31  4.27  4.00 4.08  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0 0  0  1  4 13  4.67  250/1543  4.33  4.46  4.06 4.18  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            8   0  1  0  1  5 11  4.39  682/1647  4.36  4.60  4.12 4.14  4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                  8   0  0  1  0 13  4  4.11 1470/1668  4.56  4.76  4.67 4.70  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 0  0  1  4  7  4.50  373/1605  4.28  4.36  4.07 4.16  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  584/1514  4.76  4.64  4.39 4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0  0  0  1  2 15  4.78  843/1551  4.89  4.79  4.66 4.73  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  451/1503  4.51  4.60  4.24 4.27  4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  471/1506  4.58  4.63  4.26 4.29  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  4  1  1  3  6  3  3.64  861/1311  4.16  4.19  3.85 3.88  3.64


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  3  2 12  4.53  433/1490  4.51  4.50  4.05 4.26  4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  1  1  0 15  4.71  450/1502  4.46  4.61  4.26 4.46  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0  0  2  0 15  4.76  422/1489  4.57  4.65  4.29 4.52  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   1  0  0  2  5  9  4.44  285/1006  4.42  4.28  4.00 4.21  4.44


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20 4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19 4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50 4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35 4.56  ****


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.67  4.36 4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  92  ****  4.83  4.22 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.83  4.20 4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  98  ****  4.83  3.95 3.86  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39 3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97 3.81  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33 4.50  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45 4.92  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34 2.00  ****
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 470  0101                 University of Maryland                        Page 1564
Title         SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH               Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BEMBRY, JAMES                      Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      26
Questionnaires:  26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1        0.00-0.99    0         A    7         Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0       Major       16
  28-55    1        1.00-1.99    0         B    7                                                          
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99    2         C    0         General               1     Under-grad  26       Non-major   10
  84-150   9        3.00-3.49    2         D    0                                                          
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    6         F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                11
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 470  8020              University of Maryland                                    Page 1565
Title         SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH           Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   TING, LAURA                    Fall  2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  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  0  1  1  9 10  4.33  816/1669  4.53  4.50  4.23 4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  1  3  7 10  4.24  908/1666  4.31  4.57  4.19 4.22  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  6  5  9  4.05  954/1421  4.33  4.68  4.24 4.38  4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  1  5  6  9  4.10  975/1617  4.33  4.57  4.15 4.22  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  4  8  9  4.24  575/1555  4.31  4.27  4.00 4.08  4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  7  7  7  4.00  895/1543  4.33  4.46  4.06 4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  3  5 12  4.33  759/1647  4.36  4.60  4.12 4.14  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1668  4.56  4.76  4.67 4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  3  9  4  4.06  877/1605  4.28  4.36  4.07 4.16  4.06

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  3 17  4.85  274/1514  4.76  4.64  4.39 4.45  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  0 20  5.00    1/1551  4.89  4.79  4.66 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  6 11  4.40  719/1503  4.51  4.60  4.24 4.27  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  2  6 12  4.50  642/1506  4.58  4.63  4.26 4.29  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0  0  0  1  4 14  4.68  179/1311  4.16  4.19  3.85 3.88  4.68

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  2  5 11  4.50  445/1490  4.51  4.50  4.05 4.26  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  1  1  2  4 11  4.21  907/1502  4.46  4.61  4.26 4.46  4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  2  1  4 12  4.37  837/1489  4.57  4.65  4.29 4.52  4.37
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  4  0  0  1  7  7  4.40  307/1006  4.42  4.28  4.00 4.21  4.40

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  **** ****  4.22 3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  **** ****  4.06 3.80  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  **** ****  3.97 3.81  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55  **** ****  4.34 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  **** ****  4.31 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  **** ****  4.45 4.92  ****

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99   0      A    3       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major      14
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0      B    9
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99   0      C    3       General              0      Under-grad   22       Non-major   8
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49   1      D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   7      F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               17
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 481  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1566
Title        SOCIAL WORK METHODS II            Baltimore County                                      JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  KNIGHT, CAROLYN                      Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      23
Questionnaires: 21                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               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  0  8  11  4.58  511/1669  4.46  4.50   4.23 4.39  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0  0  1  4  14  4.68  332/1666  4.45  4.57   4.19 4.22  4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3  12   0  0  0  1   5  4.83  197/1421  4.78  4.68   4.24 4.38  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0   0  0  0  7  12  4.63  358/1617  4.54  4.57   4.15 4.22  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  1  4  7   7  4.05  741/1555  4.09  4.27   4.00 4.08  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   0  0  0  3  16  4.84  126/1543  4.55  4.46   4.06 4.18  4.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0  1  0  7  11  4.47  532/1647  4.32  4.60   4.12 4.14  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0  0  0  0  19  5.00    1/1668  4.95  4.76   4.67 4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0   0  0  0  8   7  4.47  423/1605  4.28  4.36   4.07 4.16  4.47


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0  0  1  3  15  4.74  473/1514  4.60  4.64   4.39 4.45  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  0  1  0  18  4.89  539/1551  4.95  4.79   4.66 4.73  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0  0  0  7  12  4.63  425/1503  4.48  4.60   4.24 4.27  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0  0  2  3  14  4.63  509/1506  4.51  4.63   4.26 4.29  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 14   2  0  0  1   2  3.20 ****/1311  4.11  4.19   3.85 3.88  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93   99/1490  4.66  4.50   4.05 4.26  4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0  0  0  0  15  5.00    1/1502  4.78  4.61   4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0  0  0  0  15  5.00    1/1489  4.77  4.65   4.29 4.52  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93   68/1006  4.32  4.28   4.00 4.21  4.93


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18   0   0  0  0  2   1  4.33 ****/  58  **** ****   4.22 3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19   0   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  52  **** ****   4.06 3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18   1   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****   4.39 3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  40  **** ****   3.97 3.81  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  30  **** ****   4.33 4.50  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99   1       A    7        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0     Major      17
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B   11
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General              0     Under-grad  21     Non-major   4
 84-150    8        3.00-3.49   4       D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   7       F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               18
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 481  0201            University of Maryland                       Page 1567
Title       SOCIAL WORK METHODS II        Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BEMBRY, JAMES                     Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               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  1  3  9  6  4.05 1138/1669  4.46  4.50  4.23  4.39  4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     4   0  0  2  3  9  5  3.89 1242/1666  4.45  4.57  4.19  4.22  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4  12  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  331/1421  4.78  4.68  4.24  4.38  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   1  0  0  4  6  8  4.22  831/1617  4.54  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0  1  2  3  7  6  3.79 1037/1555  4.09  4.27  4.00  4.08  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  2  2  7  8  4.11  832/1543  4.55  4.46  4.06  4.18  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0  2  3  2  6  6  3.58 1365/1647  4.32  4.60  4.12  4.14  3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0  0  0  0  4 15  4.79  926/1668  4.95  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2  0  1  1  7  2  3.91 1092/1605  4.28  4.36  4.07  4.16  3.91


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  1  1  3  8  6  3.89 1273/1514  4.60  4.64  4.39  4.45  3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  539/1551  4.95  4.79  4.66  4.73  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  2  4  5  8  4.00 1066/1503  4.48  4.60  4.24  4.27  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  2  0  3  5  9  4.00 1069/1506  4.51  4.63  4.26  4.29  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 16  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1311  4.11  4.19  3.85  3.88  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  1  2  7  9  4.26  684/1490  4.66  4.50  4.05  4.26  4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  1  3 15  4.74  415/1502  4.78  4.61  4.26  4.46  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  1  5 13  4.63  564/1489  4.77  4.65  4.29  4.52  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   3  4  1  2  4  5  3.31  850/1006  4.32  4.28  4.00  4.21  3.31

              Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    22   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****

                                  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       18
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    1                                                          
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0       C    0       General               0      Under-grad   23       Non-major    5
 84-150    9        3.00-3.49    6       D    0                                                          
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    8       F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                           responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                17
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 481  0301            University of Maryland                          Page 1568
Title       SOCIAL WORK METHODS II         Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TING, LAURA                    Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 23                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	0	0	9	10	4.53	567/1669	4.46	4.50	4.23	4.39	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	472/1666	4.45	4.57	4.19	4.22	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1421	4.78	4.68	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	539/1617	4.54	4.57	4.15	4.22	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	6	3	8	3.94	872/1555	4.09	4.27	4.00	4.08	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	371/1543	4.55	4.46	4.06	4.18	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	481/1647	4.32	4.60	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.95	4.76	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	423/1605	4.28	4.36	4.07	4.16	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.60	4.64	4.39	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	4.95	4.79	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	510/1503	4.48	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	534/1506	4.51	4.63	4.26	4.29	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	890/1311	4.11	4.19	3.85	3.88	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	372/1490	4.66	4.50	4.05	4.26	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	468/1502	4.78	4.61	4.26	4.46	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	511/1489	4.77	4.65	4.29	4.52	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	368/1006	4.32	4.28	4.00	4.21	4.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.60	4.38	4.74	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

```
                                 Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			

```
I    0            Other            16
?    0
```

```
Course Section: SOWK 481  8020                      University of Maryland                             Page 1569
Title      SOCIAL WORK METHODS II                    Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   MCFEATERS, SUSA                            Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires:  22                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                  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  3   0   0   0   2   2  15  4.68  360/1669  4.46  4.50  4.23  4.39  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3   0   0   0   2   3  14  4.63  399/1666  4.45  4.57  4.19  4.22  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3  10   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  255/1421  4.78  4.68  4.24  4.38  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   4   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83  146/1617  4.54  4.57  4.15  4.22  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   2   4  13  4.58  285/1555  4.09  4.27  4.00  4.08  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  0   0   0   5  14  4.74  195/1543  4.55  4.46  4.06  4.18  4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3   0   0   0   1   3  15  4.74  232/1647  4.32  4.60  4.12  4.14  4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1668  4.95  4.76  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  0   2   8   7  4.29  642/1605  4.28  4.36  4.07  4.16  4.29


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89  206/1514  4.60  4.64  4.39  4.45  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1551  4.95  4.79  4.66  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0   0   1   3  15  4.74  300/1503  4.48  4.60  4.24  4.27  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0   0   0   1   2  16  4.79  313/1506  4.51  4.63  4.26  4.29  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0  0   2   3  13  4.61  214/1311  4.11  4.19  3.85  3.88  4.61


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0   0   1   1  15  4.82  199/1490  4.66  4.50  4.05  4.26  4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0   0   1   3  13  4.71  450/1502  4.78  4.61  4.26  4.46  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0  0   1   2  14  4.76  422/1489  4.77  4.65  4.29  4.52  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                 5   0   0   0   1   2  14  4.76  139/1006  4.32  4.28  4.00  4.21  4.76


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/   58  ****  ****  4.22  3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/   52  ****  ****  4.06  3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      20   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/   39  ****  ****  4.39  3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  20   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00  ****/   40  ****  ****  3.97  3.81  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/   30  ****  ****  4.33  4.50  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2      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               0    Under-grad   22       Non-major     8
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49    2       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6       F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                13
                                         ?    0
```