```
Course-Section: SOWK 200  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1521
Title        SOC ISSUES SOC ACTION        Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  CHAKMAKIAN, ELI              Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 27                        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   1   3   6  14  4.38   816/1649  4.38   4.57  4.28  4.29  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   0   0   3   5  16  4.54   510/1648  4.54   4.58  4.23  4.25  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0   0   0   0   4  20  4.83   212/1375  4.83   4.63  4.27  4.37  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   0   0   0   1  10  13  4.50   497/1595  4.50   4.61  4.20  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0   1   0   2   4  17  4.50   366/1533  4.50   4.34  4.04  4.04  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1   2   2   5  14  4.21   747/1512  4.21   4.50  4.10  4.14  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   0   0   0   2  22  4.92   109/1623  4.92   4.67  4.16  4.21  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   0   0   0  15   8  4.35  1333/1646  4.35   4.83  4.69  4.63  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0   0   2  12   5  4.16   801/1621  4.16   4.37  4.06  4.01  4.16


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   0   1   5  17  4.70   588/1568  4.70   4.74  4.43  4.39  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   0   1   0   3  19  4.74   967/1572  4.74   4.88  4.70  4.73  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   0   0   4  19  4.83   244/1564  4.83   4.67  4.28  4.27  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   1   0   4  18  4.70   475/1559  4.70   4.64  4.29  4.33  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 1   0   4   4  14  4.30   482/1352  4.30   4.24  3.98  4.07  4.30


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   1  19  4.86   175/1384  4.86   4.58  4.08  3.99  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   1   0   1   2  17  4.62   530/1382  4.62   4.76  4.29  4.19  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0   0   1   1  19  4.86   316/1368  4.86   4.73  4.30  4.21  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2   4   2   3   4   6  3.32   784/ 948  3.32   4.17  3.95  3.89  3.32


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 221  ****   ****  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 243  ****   ****  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 212  ****   ****  4.40  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 209  ****   ****  4.35  4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24  0   0   2   0   0   1  3.00  ****/ 555  ****   2.04  4.29  4.33  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 1  0   0   1   1   1  4.00  ****/  88  ****   ****  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 2 0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  85  ****   ****  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 2  0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  81  ****   ****  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0   0   1   0   0   3  4.25  ****/  92  ****   ****  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21  0   1   2   0   0   3  3.33  ****/ 288  ****   3.31  3.68  3.65  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  52  ****   4.50  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  48  ****   4.75  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****   4.44  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****   4.55  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 23  2   1   0   0   0   1  3.00  ****/ 312  ****   3.01  3.68  3.59  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  53  ****   ****  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  30  ****   ****  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  41  ****   ****  4.43  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  24  ****   ****  4.42  2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24  0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67  ****/ 110  ****   4.00  3.99  3.72  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  0201            University of Maryland                           Page 1522
Title      INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO          Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LAUR, JOHN A.                 Fall  2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
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  3  2 12  4.39   803/1649  4.49  4.57  4.28  4.29  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  2 16  4.89   161/1648  4.75  4.58  4.23  4.25  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  14   0  0  0  0  4  5.00  ****/1375  4.88  4.63  4.27  4.37  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  2 16  4.89   144/1595  4.85  4.61  4.20  4.22  4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0  0  2  3 10  4.53   342/1533  4.31  4.34  4.04  4.04  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  6 12  4.67   263/1512  4.68  4.50  4.10  4.14  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  1  2 15  4.78   199/1623  4.75  4.67  4.16  4.21  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  7 11  4.61  1092/1646  4.69  4.83  4.69  4.63  4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1   0  1  1  4  6  4.25   687/1621  4.37  4.37  4.06  4.01  4.25

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  1  1 16  4.83   344/1568  4.91  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  0 18  5.00     1/1572  4.98  4.88  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  4 14  4.78   310/1564  4.80  4.67  4.28  4.27  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  2  3 13  4.61   573/1559  4.75  4.64  4.29  4.33  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0  0  1  1 15  4.82   126/1352  4.82  4.24  3.98  4.07  4.82

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0  0  1  3  8  4.58   388/1384  4.56  4.58  4.08  3.99  4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0  0  1  1 10  4.75   394/1382  4.67  4.76  4.29  4.19  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0  0  2  1  9  4.58   594/1368  4.62  4.73  4.30  4.21  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   2   0  0  1  2  7  4.60   170/ 948  4.25  4.17  3.95  3.89  4.60

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.62  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15   2   1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.33  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15  0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15  0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0   0  1  0  1  3  4.20    72/ 288  4.20  3.31  3.68  3.65  4.20

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  4.75  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  39  ****  4.44  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  39  ****  4.55  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   2   0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.59  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     14   2   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  3.72  ****
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1      0.00-0.99   0        A   13        Required for Majors  0       Graduate    0       Major       13
 28-55    2      1.00-1.99   0        B    2                                                         
 56-83    2      2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General              0       Under-grad  18      Non-major    5
 84-150   1      3.00-3.49   7        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               15
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  0301           University of Maryland                                      Page 1523
Title        INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO       Baltimore County                                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  LAUR, JOHN A.                Fall   2008                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
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	0	0	0	2	4	6	10	4.09	1122/1649	4.49	4.57	4.28	4.29	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	510/1648	4.75	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.88	4.63	4.27	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	272/1595	4.85	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	3	6	8	3.95	865/1533	4.31	4.34	4.04	4.04	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	380/1512	4.68	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	251/1623	4.75	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	977/1646	4.69	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	886/1621	4.37	4.37	4.06	4.01	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	245/1568	4.91	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1572	4.98	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	263/1564	4.80	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	376/1559	4.75	4.64	4.29	4.33	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	188/1352	4.82	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	726/1384	4.56	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	825/1382	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.19	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	764/1368	4.62	4.73	4.30	4.21	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	431/ 948	4.25	4.17	3.95	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 288	4.20	3.31	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.55	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	17				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  8620              University of Maryland                                    Page 1524
Title      INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO            Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MORRIS, KATHERI                Fall  2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
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    8  0  0  0  0  0 17 5.00   1/1649  4.49  4.57  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     8  0  0  0  1  1 15 4.82 202/1648  4.75  4.58  4.23  4.25  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    8 10  0  0  0  0  7 5.00   1/1375  4.88  4.63  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8  0  0  0  0  1 16 4.94  80/1595  4.85  4.61  4.20  4.22  4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  1  2  2 11 4.44 443/1533  4.31  4.34  4.04  4.04  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 1  0  0  0  2 13 4.87 128/1512  4.68  4.50  4.10  4.14  4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             9  0  0  0  1  2 13 4.75 220/1623  4.75  4.67  4.16  4.21  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   9  0  1  0  0  0 15 4.75 913/1646  4.69  4.83  4.69  4.63  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0  0  0  0  3 12 4.80 133/1621  4.37  4.37  4.06  4.01  4.80


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8  0  0  0  0  0 17 5.00   1/1568  4.91  4.74  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8  0  0  0  0  0 17 5.00   1/1572  4.98  4.88  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0  0  0  1  1 15 4.82 244/1564  4.80  4.67  4.28  4.27  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8  0  0  0  1  0 16 4.88 227/1559  4.75  4.64  4.29  4.33  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 0  0  0  0  1 16 4.94  61/1352  4.82  4.24  3.98  4.07  4.94


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  0  1 15 4.94 105/1384  4.56  4.58  4.08  3.99  4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  0  0 16 5.00   1/1382  4.67  4.76  4.29  4.19  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0  0  0  2 14 4.88 295/1368  4.62  4.73  4.30  4.21  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                   9  3  1  0  1  5  6 4.15 385/ 948  4.25  4.17  3.95  3.89  4.15

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20 0  0  3  0  0  2 3.20 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.33  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 19 0  1  0  1  4  0 3.33 ****/ 288  4.20  3.31  3.68  3.65  ****


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  21 0  0  0  2  2  0 3.50 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.59  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      24 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  3.72  ****

                            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     1      Major      11
 28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0       B    4
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99   2       C    3      General              0      Under-grad   24     Non-major  14
 84-150    1      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              14
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1525
Title      INTRO SOCIAL WORK I            Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BAFFOUR, TIFFAN            Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 34                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Freq	uenc	ies			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	1	0	4	6	15	4.31	912/1649	4.48	4.57	4.28	4.29	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	1	4	6	14	4.19	966/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	1	2	7	14	4.28	780/1375	4.27	4.63	4.27	4.37	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	2	1	9	14	4.35	709/1595	4.35	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	1	6	15	4.28	594/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	564/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	459/1623	4.32	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	266/1646	4.81	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	1	4	6	8	3.81	1151/1621	4.02	4.37	4.06	4.01	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	0	6	17	4.52	827/1568	4.42	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	840/1572	4.77	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	4	3	17	4.40	780/1564	4.23	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	7	14	4.24	980/1559	4.24	4.64	4.29	4.33	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	2	1	3	4	14	4.13	616/1352	4.03	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	367/1384	4.50	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	312/1382	4.74	4.76	4.29	4.19	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	337/1368	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.21	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	133/ 948	4.21	4.17	3.95	3.89	4.72
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****

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	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1526
Title       INTRO SOCIAL WORK I              Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  JANI, JAYSHREE                  Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 32                     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 20  4.80  274/1649  4.48 4.57 4.28 4.29 4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7   0  0  0  2  8 15  4.52  533/1648  4.19 4.58 4.23 4.25 4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8   0  0  0  1  8 15  4.58  480/1375  4.27 4.63 4.27 4.37 4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7   0  0  0  2  7 16  4.56  428/1595  4.35 4.61 4.20 4.22 4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  1  1  7 16  4.52  350/1533  4.33 4.34 4.04 4.04 4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 0  1  1  8 15  4.48  408/1512  4.28 4.50 4.10 4.14 4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            8   0  0  0  3  7 14  4.46  568/1623  4.32 4.67 4.16 4.21 4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                  8   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  332/1646  4.81 4.83 4.69 4.63 4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 0 0  1 12  6  4.26  676/1621  4.02 4.37 4.06 4.01 4.26


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10  0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  535/1568  4.42 4.74 4.43 4.39 4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    9  0  0  0  0  1 22  4.96  296/1572  4.77 4.88 4.70 4.73 4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  0  2  4 16  4.64  511/1564  4.23 4.67 4.28 4.27 4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     10  0  0  0  1  3 18  4.77  361/1559  4.24 4.64 4.29 4.33 4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1  0  5 15  4.62  240/1352  4.03 4.24 3.98 4.07 4.62


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  0  2  2 15  4.68  310/1384  4.50 4.58 4.08 3.99 4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0  0  2  1 16  4.74  414/1382  4.74 4.76 4.29 4.19 4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0  0  3 16  4.84  327/1368  4.73 4.73 4.30 4.21 4.84
4. Were special techniques successful                  13  7  1  0  2  3  6  4.08  413/ 948  4.21 4.17 3.95 3.89 4.08


                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30  0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 555  **** 2.04 4.29 4.33 ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  88  **** **** 4.54 3.75 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28  2  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 288  **** 3.31 3.68 3.65 ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29  1  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 312  **** 3.01 3.68 3.59 ****


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     30  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 110  **** 4.00 3.99 3.72 ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4      0.00-0.99   1     A   10      Required for Majors  2      Graduate      0      Major       17
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0     B   10
  56-83      4      2.00-2.99   0     C    1      General              1      Under-grad   32      Non-major   15
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49   4     D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3     F    0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               19
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  8620                University of Maryland                                Page 1527
Title      INTRO SOCIAL WORK I                   Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    LOVE, YVONNA                        Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 30                      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  1  1  3  2 15  4.32  898/1649  4.48  4.57  4.28  4.29  4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     8  0  1  0  9  3  9  3.86 1262/1648  4.19  4.58  4.23  4.25  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    8  0  1  2  5  3 11  3.95  992/1375  4.27  4.63  4.27  4.37  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8  0  1  0  7  1 13  4.14  970/1595  4.35  4.61  4.20  4.22  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8  0  2  1  1  5 13  4.18  688/1533  4.33  4.34  4.04  4.04  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8  0  2  1  5  1 13  4.00  883/1512  4.28  4.50  4.10  4.14  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             8  0  1  2  5  3 11  3.95 1104/1623  4.32  4.67  4.16  4.21  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                   9  0  0  0  0 10 11  4.52 1175/1646  4.81  4.83  4.69  4.63  4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14  2  0  0  5  4  5  4.00  914/1621  4.02  4.37  4.06  4.01  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10  0  1  1  4  5  9  4.00 1279/1568  4.42  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   10  0  1  0  1  3 15  4.55 1193/1572  4.77  4.88  4.70  4.73  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  3  0  4  7  6  3.65 1340/1564  4.23  4.67  4.28  4.27  3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      9  0  2  1  6  4  8  3.71 1301/1559  4.24  4.64  4.29  4.33  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9  0  4  2  4  5  6  3.33 1130/1352  4.03  4.24  3.98  4.07  3.33

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  0  4  5 11  4.19  708/1384  4.50  4.58  4.08  3.99  4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  1  0  1 19  4.64  511/1382  4.74  4.76  4.29  4.19  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  2  0  5 15  4.50  654/1368  4.73  4.73  4.30  4.21  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   8  5  1  4  0  4  8  3.82  569/ 948  4.21  4.17  3.95  3.89  3.82

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.33  ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25  2  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.65  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25  3  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.59  ****

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     27  0  1  1  0  1  0  2.33 ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  3.72  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2       0.00-0.99   0      A  11        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major       9
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0      B   5
  56-83     5       2.00-2.99   3      C   3        General              0      Under-grad  30       Non-major  21
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49   2      D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   5      F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other               19
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1528
Title       INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I        Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BAFFOUR, TIFFAN                  Fall   2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  5                    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
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   4   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.33  ****

             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear      4   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.65  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA       Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99  0        A   0       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99  0        B   0
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99  0        C   0       General              0    Under-grad   5      Non-major   5
  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                0
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 360  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1529
Title           SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I       Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:     RUBIN, ANDREA D              Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  19                     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  0  4  10  4.53   603/1649  4.52  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     4   0  0  1  0  3  11  4.60   441/1648  4.56  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4   0  0  0  0  4  11  4.73   321/1375  4.72  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   0  0  2  1  3   9  4.27   806/1595  4.41  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0  2  1  7  1   4  3.27  1362/1533  3.86  4.34  4.04  4.05  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  0  2  5   8  4.40   522/1512  4.34  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0  1  0  0  2  12  4.60   395/1623  4.49  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0  0  0  0  7   8  4.53  1166/1646  4.64  4.83  4.69  4.67  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  1  1  6   6  4.21   731/1621  4.44  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.21

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  0  1  2  11  4.71   554/1568  4.71  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  1  2  11  4.71  1003/1572  4.71  4.88  4.70  4.64  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  0  2  3   9  4.50   651/1564  4.64  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  1  0  2  11  4.64   536/1559  4.68  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  0  0  0  2  5   7  4.36   440/1352  4.36  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.36

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  1  4  10  4.60   376/1384  4.68  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80   342/1382  4.84  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87   306/1368  4.90  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.87
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   5  2  0  4  2   2  3.20   811/ 948  3.87  4.17  3.95  4.00  3.20

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13   1  1  2  2  0   0  2.20   519/ 555  2.35  2.04  4.29  4.22  2.20

              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 12   2  2  1  0  2   0  2.40   260/ 288  2.40  3.31  3.68  3.58  2.40

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  48  ****  4.75  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  4.44  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  4.55  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  13   1  2  0  1  2   0  2.60   278/ 312  2.60  3.01  3.68  3.60  2.60

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      16   0  1  0  1  1   0  2.67  ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  4.05  ****
```

```
                                          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   3
  56-83     8          2.00-2.99   1          C   0          General              0       Under-grad  19       Non-major    5
  84-150    3          3.00-3.49   4          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               12
                                              ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 360  0201              University of Maryland                           Page 1530
Title         SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I        Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   TICE, CAROLYN                 Fall   2008                                       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   4   0   0   2   1   2  15  4.50   644/1649  4.52  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   0   1   2   3  15  4.52   533/1648  4.56  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0   0   0   2   2  17  4.71   347/1375  4.72  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0   0   1   1   4  14  4.55   440/1595  4.41  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  1   0   0   4   3  13  4.45   432/1533  3.86  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  1   0   4   3  13  4.29   651/1512  4.34  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   1   1   2   2  15  4.38   659/1623  4.49  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   0   0   0   5  15  4.75   913/1646  4.64  4.83  4.69  4.67  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  0   0   2   1  12  4.67   234/1621  4.44  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   1   1   1  17  4.70   588/1568  4.71  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   0   1   1   1  17  4.70  1034/1572  4.71  4.88  4.70  4.64  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   0   1   2  16  4.79   294/1564  4.64  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0   0   0   2   1  15  4.72   434/1559  4.68  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0  1   0   3   2  13  4.37   432/1352  4.36  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.37


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   1   0   1  14  4.75   247/1384  4.68  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   0   1   0  16  4.88   262/1382  4.84  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   0   1  16  4.94   158/1368  4.90  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   2   0   0   2   3  10  4.53   193/ 948  3.87  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.53


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0  0  1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23  0  0  0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  0   3   1   0   0   2  2.50   511/ 555  2.35  2.04  4.29  4.22  2.50


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23  0  0  1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0  0  0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  2   0   1   0   4   0  3.60  ****/ 288  2.40  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  4.75  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       23  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  39  ****  4.44  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   23  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  39  ****  4.55  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20  0   1   2   0   1   0  2.25  ****/ 312  2.60  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    23  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       23  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20  0   0   1   0   3   0  3.50  ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  4.05  ****
```

Title   SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I   Baltimore County   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN   Fall   2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   8   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   15
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   8
56-83   8   2.00-2.99   2   C   3   General   0   Under-grad   24   Non-major   9
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   3   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   19
                                          ?   1

```
Course-Section: SOWK 387  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1531
Title       POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN           Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DEMIDENKO, MICH                 Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
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    0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1649  5.00  4.57  4.28  4.27  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1648  5.00  4.58  4.23  4.18  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1   1   0   0   1  11  4.62  453/1375  4.62  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1595  5.00  4.61  4.20  4.21  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   4   8  4.43  454/1533  4.43  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0   0   0   1  13  4.93   88/1512  4.93  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1  13  4.93   97/1623  4.93  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.83  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0   0   0   1  12  4.92   75/1621  4.92  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.92


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1568  5.00  4.74  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.88  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1564  5.00  4.67  4.28  4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.64  4.29  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0   0   0   3  11  4.79  142/1352  4.79  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.79


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   2  12  4.86  175/1384  4.86  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0   0   1   1  12  4.79  362/1382  4.79  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0   0   0   1  13  4.93  211/1368  4.93  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0   0   0   3   3   8  4.36  302/ 948  4.36  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.36


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.22  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   1   1   0   0   1   0  2.50  ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0      A   11       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major      11
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0      B    1                                                         
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0      C    0       General              4      Under-grad   14       Non-major   3
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49    1      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                7
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  0101            University of Maryland                                      Page 1532
Title      HUMAN BEHAVIOR                   Baltimore County                                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   OKUNDAYE, JOSHU                Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires: 38                          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   1   1   2  23  4.74  339/1649  4.60  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    11   0   0   0   1   2  24  4.85  182/1648  4.67  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   11   0   0   0   1   2  24  4.85  199/1375  4.75  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    11   2   0   0   1   1  23  4.88  144/1595  4.57  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   1   3  23  4.81  146/1533  4.51  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 11 0  0   0   1   2  24  4.85  133/1512  4.51  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            11   0   0   0   0   3  24  4.89  130/1623  4.72  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  12   0   0   0   0  10  16  4.62 1092/1646  4.86  4.83  4.69  4.67  4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0 1  0   1   5  16  4.52  356/1621  4.19  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.52


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        13   0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  273/1568  4.67  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   12   0   0   0   0   1  25  4.96  237/1572  4.86  4.88  4.70  4.64  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16  0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86  206/1564  4.61  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     14   0   1   0   0   1  22  4.79  332/1559  4.64  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 15 0  0   1   2   3  4.33 ****/1352  3.82  4.24  3.98  3.97  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   1   1   2  17  4.67  326/1384  4.60  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   0   1   3  17  4.76  383/1382  4.80  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0  0   1   0   1  19  4.81  369/1368  4.80  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.81
4. Were special techniques successful                  18   5   1   0   0   4  10  4.47  234/ 948  4.32  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.47


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           37   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  35   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.22  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 36 0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    37   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                34   2   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  36  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  4.75  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       37   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  39  ****  4.44  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   37   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  39  ****  4.55  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  35  0   2   0   0   1   0  2.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36  0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    36   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.44  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	30
84-150	0	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	18				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  0201              University of Maryland                          Page 1533
Title       HUMAN BEHAVIOR                    Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL                     Fall  2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
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  3  0  0  0  3  5 10  4.39  803/1649  4.60 4.57  4.28 4.27  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3  0  0  0  2  8  8  4.33  797/1648  4.67 4.58  4.23 4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3  0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  334/1375  4.75 4.63  4.27 4.22  4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   3  0  0  0  2 10  6  4.22  853/1595  4.57 4.61  4.20 4.21  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 0  1  1  5  9  4.38  505/1533  4.51 4.34  4.04 4.05  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 3 0 3 10 4.25 687/1512  4.51 4.50  4.10 4.11  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           5  0  0  0  0  6 10  4.63  370/1623  4.72 4.67  4.16 4.08  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                 5  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1646  4.86 4.83  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 1 5 5 1 3.50 1345/1621  4.19 4.37  4.06 4.02  3.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  1  3  5  8  4.18 1183/1568  4.67 4.74  4.43 4.39  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4  0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65 1096/1572  4.86 4.88  4.70 4.64  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0  4  6  6  4.13 1064/1564  4.61 4.67  4.28 4.25  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  2  1  7  7  4.12 1067/1559  4.64 4.64  4.29 4.23  4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 2 3 1 3 5 2 3.14 1195/1352  3.82 4.24  3.98 3.97  3.14

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 4 8 4.33 613/1384  4.60 4.58  4.08 4.11  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 464/1382  4.80 4.76  4.29 4.37  4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 426/1368  4.80 4.73  4.30 4.39  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  2  0  1  1  8  4  4.07  415/ 948  4.32 4.17  3.95 4.00  4.07

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 243  **** ****  4.12 3.89  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555  **** 2.04  4.29 4.22  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/  88  **** ****  4.54 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/  85  **** ****  4.47 4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/  81  **** ****  4.43 4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   19  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  **** ****  4.35 4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               17  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/ 288  **** 3.31  3.68 3.58  ****

            Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  **** 4.44  4.47 4.43  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 4 0 4.00 ****/ 312  **** 3.01  3.68 3.60  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades         Reasons                Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2      0.00-0.99   0       A   4     Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major      14
  28-55    1      1.00-1.99   0       B   9                                Under-grad  21      Non-major   7
  56-83    7      2.00-2.99   1       C   1     General              0
  84-150   0      3.00-3.49   4       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               14
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  8620                 University of Maryland                              Page 1534
Title       HUMAN BEHAVIOR                      Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  THIEL, MINDY                       Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 28                         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  2  4 18  4.67  433/1649  4.60  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     5  0  0  0  1  2 20  4.83  202/1648  4.67  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4  0  0  0  2  4 18  4.67  401/1375  4.75  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     5  0  0  0  1  7 15  4.61  383/1595  4.57  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  3  9 11  4.35  535/1533  4.51  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 0  0  4  5 14  4.43  479/1512  4.51  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5  0  0  1  1  3 18  4.65  333/1623  4.72  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5  0  0  0  0  1 22  4.96  332/1646  4.86  4.83  4.69  4.67  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  1  8 13  4.55  339/1621  4.19  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.55


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4  0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  123/1568  4.67  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  296/1572  4.86  4.88  4.70  4.64  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  1  2 21  4.83  234/1564  4.61  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  0  0  0  0  0 24  5.00    1/1559  4.64  4.64  4.29  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 2  0  1  1 18  4.50  303/1352  3.82  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.50


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  0  2 21  4.79  210/1384  4.60  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1 22  4.96  122/1382  4.80  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  1  0  1 22  4.83  337/1368  4.80  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  1  0  2  0  7 14  4.43  257/ 948  4.32  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.43


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25  0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.22  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  4.75  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.44  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.55  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24  0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  4.05  ****
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  8620            University of Maryland                    Page 1534
Title      HUMAN BEHAVIOR                    Baltimore County                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    THIEL, MINDY                    Fall   2008                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 28                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4         0.00-0.99   1       A   11       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55     1         1.00-1.99   0       B   12
 56-83     4         2.00-2.99   2       C    0       General              1    Under-grad  28       Non-major   28
 84-150    0         3.00-3.49   4       D    0
 Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   5       F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               21
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 389  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1535
Title       HUMAN BEHAVIOR II                 Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  OKUNDAYE, JOSHU                   Fall   2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires:  38                    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  20  0  0  0  2  4 12  4.56  577/1649  4.56  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   20  0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61  427/1648  4.61  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  20  0  0  0  4  5  9  4.28  788/1375  4.28  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   20  0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  263/1595  4.72  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  198/1533  4.72  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  217/1512  4.72  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           20  0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  199/1623  4.78  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                 20  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  398/1646  4.94  4.83  4.69  4.67  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26  0  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  595/1621  4.33  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       21  0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65  667/1568  4.65  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  21  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  355/1572  4.94  4.88  4.70  4.64  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22  0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  590/1564  4.56  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    22  0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  487/1559  4.69  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22  8  1  2  0  0  5  3.75 ****/1352  ****  4.24  3.98  3.97  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24  0  2  0  0  3  9  4.21  697/1384  4.21  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24  0  0  0  1  0 13  4.86  292/1382  4.86  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24  0  0  1  1  2 10  4.50  654/1368  4.50  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 24  5  0  1  0  1  7  4.56 ****/ 948  ****  4.17  3.95  4.00  ****


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29  0  1  4  2  1  1  2.67 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.22  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               32  1  0  1  1  3  0  3.40 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29  2  3  1  0  3  0  2.43 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    37  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  4.05  ****

                                      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      0      1.00-1.99   0      B   5                                                      
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99   3      C   1      General              0     Under-grad   38      Non-major    25
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49   1      D   0                                                      
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   5      F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               13
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1536
Title       ADVOCATES PROGRAM             Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO              Fall  2008                                       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   0  0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25   965/1649  4.53  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   362/1648  4.23  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1375  4.50  4.63  4.27  4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   497/1595  4.63  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   241/1533  4.58  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  0  3  4.40   883/1512  4.40  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1623  4.90  4.67  4.16  4.08  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1646  5.00  4.83  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   595/1621  4.33  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.33


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1568  4.90  4.74  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1572  4.90  4.88  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1564  4.90  4.67  4.28  4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   695/1559  4.55  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00   690/1352  4.30  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00   795/1384  4.30  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1382  4.80  4.76  4.29  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00   948/1368  4.30  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50   699/ 948  4.05  4.17  3.95  4.00  3.50


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50   544/ 555  1.25  2.04  4.29  4.22  1.50


             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      3  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00    40/ 110  4.00  4.00  3.99  4.05  4.00

                               Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned       Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A   3       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B   0
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C   0       General              1     Under-grad    4      Non-major   4
 84-150    2      3.00-3.49    2        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 0102          University of Maryland                        Page 1537
Title      ADVOCATES PROGRAM             Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  ROHRBACH, ALISO            Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
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  1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  274/1649  4.53  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  1  0  0  2  2  3.80 1313/1648  4.23  4.58  4.23  4.18  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  1  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  950/1375  4.50  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  236/1595  4.63  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  366/1533  4.58  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  156/1512  4.40  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  169/1623  4.90  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.83  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  595/1621  4.33  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.33


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  387/1568  4.90  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  840/1572  4.90  4.88  4.70  4.64  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  263/1564  4.90  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  586/1559  4.55  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  247/1352  4.30  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.60


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  376/1384  4.30  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  540/1382  4.80  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  579/1368  4.30  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  170/ 948  4.05  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.60


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4  0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00  553/ 555  1.25  2.04  4.29  4.22  1.00


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               4  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  4  0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00  308/ 312  1.00  3.01  3.68  3.60  1.00


             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    5  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 110  4.00  4.00  3.99  4.05  ****

                                  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       0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0      B   0
 56-83      2        2.00-2.99   1      C   0      General              3      Under-grad   6      Non-major   6
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49   2      D   0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   0      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 1538
Title       ADDICTIVE BEHAV PATTER          Baltimore County                                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: DVORAK, MICHAEL                 Fall  2008                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 36                 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  12  0  0  0  0  4  20  4.83  247/1649  4.83  4.57  4.28  4.27  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   11  0  0  0  0  3  22  4.88  161/1648  4.88  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  11  0  0  0  1  3  21  4.80  233/1375  4.80  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   11  1  0  0  0  2  22  4.92  119/1595  4.92  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  1  1  2  20  4.71  210/1533  4.71  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  4  20  4.83  142/1512  4.83  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           11  0  0  0  0  2  23  4.92   97/1623  4.92  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 11  0  0  0  0  0  25  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.83  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16  1  0  0  0  4  15  4.79  146/1621  4.79  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.79


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       14  0  0  0  0  3  19  4.86  301/1568  4.86  4.74  4.43  4.39  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14  0  0  0  0  0  22  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.88  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14  0  0  0  0  3  19  4.86  206/1564  4.86  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14  0  0  0  0  1  21  4.95  103/1559  4.95  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14  0  0  0  1  4  17  4.73  172/1352  4.73  4.24  3.98  3.97  4.73


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  1  2  14  4.76  238/1384  4.76  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  146/1382  4.94  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  158/1368  4.94  4.73  4.30  4.39  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                 19  4  1  1  2  2  7  4.00  431/ 948  4.00  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.00


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 34  0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.22  ****


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               35  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  4.75  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.44  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.55  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 32  1  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1         0.00-0.99   0       A  10          Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0       Major        4
 28-55     2         1.00-1.99   0       B   5
 56-83     1         2.00-2.99   2       C   0          General              6    Under-grad  36       Non-major   32
 84-150    3         3.00-3.49   4       D   0
 Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   2       F   0          Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I   0          Other                7
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 397  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1539
Title      SOCIAL WORK METHODS I           Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    KNIGHT, CAROLYN              Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
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  0 10 5.00   1/1649  5.00  4.57  4.28  4.27  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  8 4.80  216/1648  4.80  4.58  4.23  4.18  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  5  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  233/1375  4.80  4.63  4.27  4.22  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  2  7 4.60  383/1595  4.60  4.61  4.20  4.21  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  327/1533  4.56  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  179/1512  4.78  4.50  4.10  4.11  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  448/1623  4.56  4.67  4.16  4.08  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  3  6 4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.83  4.69  4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  191/1621  4.71  4.37  4.06  4.02  4.71

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 10 5.00   1/1568  5.00  4.74  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 10 5.00   1/1572  5.00  4.88  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  8 4.80  263/1564  4.80  4.67  4.28  4.25  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  2  8 4.80  318/1559  4.80  4.64  4.29  4.23  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/1352  ****  4.24  3.98  3.97  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  165/1384  4.88  4.58  4.08  4.11  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  272/1382  4.88  4.76  4.29  4.37  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00   1/1368  5.00  4.73  4.30  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  1  0  0  1  1  4 4.50  203/ 948  4.50  4.17  3.95  4.00  4.50

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8  0  0  0  0  2  0 4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.58  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8  0  0  0  0  2  0 4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.60  ****

                          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        8
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B   3
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99   0        C   0     General        0     Under-grad  10      Non-major    2
 84-150    0      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          7
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 470  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1540
Title       SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH           Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES                  Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  11                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  1  9  4.90  186/1649  4.57  4.57  4.28  4.50  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  216/1648  4.44  4.58  4.23  4.36  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  166/1375  4.49  4.63  4.27  4.48  4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  2  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  150/1595  4.48  4.61  4.20  4.36  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  0  1  1  6  3.90  915/1533  3.99  4.34  4.04  4.14  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 310/1512 4.39 4.50 4.10 4.26 4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  121/1623  4.70  4.67  4.16  4.27  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.83  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 4 6 4.60 288/1621 4.59 4.37 4.06 4.24 4.60


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  588/1568  4.76  4.74  4.43  4.54  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  591/1572  4.95  4.88  4.70  4.79  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  434/1564  4.70  4.67  4.28  4.40  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  318/1559  4.69  4.64  4.29  4.41  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  1  0  2  1  4  3.88  836/1352  4.16  4.24  3.98  4.07  3.88


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  160/1384  4.58  4.58  4.08  4.35  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  262/1382  4.54  4.76  4.29  4.56  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  285/1368  4.49  4.73  4.30  4.58  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  2  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  265/ 948  3.99  4.17  3.95  4.31  4.43


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7  0  0  2  1  0  1  3.00  490/ 555  3.00  2.04  4.29  4.41  3.00


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 7  2  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 288  ****  3.31  3.68  3.71  ****


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.95  ****


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  4.22  ****

                                    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      10
 28-55     0         1.00-1.99  0        B   4
 56-83     2         2.00-2.99  2        C   0         General              0        Under-grad  11        Non-major   1
 84-150    2         3.00-3.49  1        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                8
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 470  8620            University of Maryland                              Page 1541
Title       SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH           Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    TING, LAURA                     Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
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  0  0  3  3  6  4.25  965/1649  4.57  4.57  4.28  4.50  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0  1  0  2  3  6  4.08 1076/1648  4.44  4.58  4.23  4.36  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0  1  0  3  1  7  4.08  922/1375  4.49  4.63  4.27  4.48  4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  3  5  4  4.08 1021/1595  4.48  4.61  4.20  4.36  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  2  0  5  5  4.08  761/1533  3.99  4.34  4.04  4.14  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 1  0  1  3  6  4.18  764/1512  4.39  4.50  4.10  4.26  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  1  0  0  2  9  4.50  502/1623  4.70  4.67  4.16  4.27  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.83  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0  0  0  3  4  4.57  313/1621  4.59  4.37  4.06  4.24  4.57

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  372/1568  4.76  4.74  4.43  4.54  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1572  4.95  4.88  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  434/1564  4.70  4.67  4.28  4.40  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  1  0  2  9  4.58  607/1559  4.69  4.64  4.29  4.41  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 1  0  1  0  9  4.45  351/1352  4.16  4.24  3.98  4.07  4.45

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  3  2  6  4.27  661/1384  4.58  4.58  4.08  4.35  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  1  2  2  6  4.18  875/1382  4.54  4.76  4.29  4.56  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  2  1  2  6  4.09  922/1368  4.49  4.73  4.30  4.58  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   2  1  2  1  1  4  3.56  688/ 948  3.99  4.17  3.95  4.31  3.56

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.50  4.06  4.86  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.01  3.68  3.95  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0       A   8      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0      Major       9
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0       B   2
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0       C   2      General               0      Under-grad  15      Non-major   6
 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                12
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  0101             University of Maryland                                      Page 1542
Title        SOCIAL WORK METHODS II         Baltimore County                                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   KNIGHT, CAROLYN                Fall   2008                                              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     0   0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86  230/1649  4.51  4.57  4.28  4.50  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86  182/1648  4.69  4.58  4.23  4.36  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0  11  0  0  0  0   3  5.00  ****/1375  5.00  4.63  4.27  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  4  10  4.71  272/1595  4.64  4.61  4.20  4.36  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   0  0  0  1  4   8  4.54  342/1533  4.26  4.34  4.04  4.14  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  3  10  4.77  186/1512  4.46  4.50  4.10  4.26  4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              1   0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92   97/1623  4.62  4.67  4.16  4.27  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                    1   0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  531/1646  4.91  4.83  4.69  4.71  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  0  0  1   7  4.88  105/1621  4.38  4.37  4.06  4.24  4.88


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86  316/1568  4.73  4.74  4.43  4.54  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  0  14  5.00    1/1572  4.89  4.88  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  0  4  10  4.71  406/1564  4.67  4.67  4.28  4.40  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   1  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  164/1559  4.62  4.64  4.29  4.41  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   9  1  0  0  1   2  3.75  914/1352  3.69  4.24  3.98  4.07  3.75


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  1  1  12  4.79  219/1384  4.54  4.58  4.08  4.35  4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0  0  0  0  1  13  4.93  194/1382  4.78  4.76  4.29  4.56  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1   0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  211/1368  4.85  4.73  4.30  4.58  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                    1   1  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   82/ 948  4.36  4.17  3.95  4.31  4.92


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13   0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00  ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.41  ****


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 10   1  0  0  0  3   0  4.00  ****/ 288  3.33  3.31  3.68  3.71  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  10   0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00    1/  52  4.50  4.50  4.06  4.86  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  10   0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00    1/  48  4.75  4.75  4.09  4.42  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        10   0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00    1/  39  4.44  4.44  4.47  4.52  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    10   0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00    1/  39  4.55  4.55  4.38  4.59  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   8   0  0  0  0  2   4  4.67   21/ 312  3.81  3.01  3.68  3.95  4.67

                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A    6      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major        10
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    5
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   3       C    0      General               0     Under-grad  14      Non-major     4
  84-150     7      3.00-3.49   3       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                10
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  0201            University of Maryland                                     Page 1543
Title      SOCIAL WORK METHODS II          Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BEMBRY, JAMES                   Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
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    0   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95  112/1649  4.51  4.57  4.28  4.50  4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95   89/1648  4.69  4.58  4.23  4.36  4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  12   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.63  4.27  4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  133/1595  4.64  4.61  4.20  4.36  4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   0   3   1  15  4.63  264/1533  4.26  4.34  4.04  4.14  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  110/1512  4.46  4.50  4.10  4.26  4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2   2  16  4.70  284/1623  4.62  4.67  4.16  4.27  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  833/1646  4.91  4.83  4.69  4.71  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   1   0   0   3  15  4.63  261/1621  4.38  4.37  4.06  4.24  4.63


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  316/1568  4.73  4.74  4.43  4.54  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  20  5.00    1/1572  4.89  4.88  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95  101/1564  4.67  4.67  4.28  4.40  4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  205/1559  4.62  4.64  4.29  4.41  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12   1   1   1   0   4  3.71  942/1352  3.69  4.24  3.98  4.07  3.71


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84  180/1384  4.54  4.58  4.08  4.35  4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89  252/1382  4.78  4.76  4.29  4.56  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   0   0   1  18  4.95  158/1368  4.85  4.73  4.30  4.58  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   1   1   1   1   1  14  4.44  249/ 948  4.36  4.17  3.95  4.31  4.44


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  18  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50  ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.41  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 14  0   1   0   1   4   0  3.33  208/ 288  3.33  3.31  3.68  3.71  3.33


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  52  4.50  4.50  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  4.75  4.75  4.09  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  4.44  4.44  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  4.55  4.55  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  14  0   1   0   0   4   1  3.67  207/ 312  3.81  3.01  3.68  3.95  3.67


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A   15     Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0     Major       19
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    3
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    1       C    0     General               0    Under-grad   20     Non-major    1
  84-150    7       3.00-3.49    3       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                19
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  0301           University of Maryland                              Page 1544
Title        SOCIAL WORK METHODS II        Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    TING, LAURA                  Fall   2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires: 17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	1183/1649	4.51	4.57	4.28	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	441/1648	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.36	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	342/1595	4.64	4.61	4.20	4.36	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	718/1533	4.26	4.34	4.04	4.14	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	436/1512	4.46	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	469/1623	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	632/1621	4.38	4.37	4.06	4.24	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	636/1568	4.73	4.74	4.43	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	840/1572	4.89	4.88	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	620/1564	4.67	4.67	4.28	4.40	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1088/1559	4.62	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	996/1352	3.69	4.24	3.98	4.07	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	771/1384	4.54	4.58	4.08	4.35	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	455/1382	4.78	4.76	4.29	4.56	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	327/1368	4.85	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	411/ 948	4.36	4.17	3.95	4.31	4.09
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	3.33	3.31	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	34/ 52	4.50	4.50	4.06	4.86	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	16/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.09	4.42	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	35/ 39	4.44	4.44	4.47	4.52	3.88
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	26/ 39	4.55	4.55	4.38	4.59	4.10
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	3	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	255/ 312	3.81	3.01	3.68	3.95	3.11
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.22	****

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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	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	12				

?   0

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  8620              University of Maryland                           Page 1545
Title       SOCIAL WORK METHODS II          Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU                  Fall   2008                                     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   4   0  0  0  4  3  7  4.21 1007/1649  4.51  4.57  4.28  4.50  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  3  3  8  4.36  770/1648  4.69  4.58  4.23  4.36  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  12  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1375  5.00  4.63  4.27  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   1  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  759/1595  4.64  4.61  4.20  4.36  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  1  4  3  5  3.71 1103/1533  4.26  4.34  4.04  4.14  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 2 3 2 6 3.71 1143/1512  4.46  4.50  4.10  4.26  3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0  1  1  0  2  9  4.31  757/1623  4.62  4.67  4.16  4.27  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  531/1646  4.91  4.83  4.69  4.71  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 1 0 3 4 3 3.73 1217/1621  4.38  4.37  4.06  4.24  3.73

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  803/1568  4.73  4.74  4.43  4.54  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  912/1572  4.89  4.88  4.70  4.79  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  0  0  2  2  8  4.50  651/1564  4.67  4.67  4.28  4.40  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  607/1559  4.62  4.64  4.29  4.41  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1352  3.69  4.24  3.98  4.07  ****

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  1  2  9  4.46  478/1384  4.54  4.58  4.08  4.35  4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  530/1382  4.78  4.76  4.29  4.56  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67  522/1368  4.85  4.73  4.30  4.58  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   8  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  431/ 948  4.36  4.17  3.95  4.31  4.00

          Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 ****/ 555  ****  2.04  4.29  4.41  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  3  2  0  1  1  0  2.25 ****/ 288  3.33  3.31  3.68  3.71  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  52  4.50  4.50  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  48  4.75  4.75  4.09  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  4.44  4.44  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  4.55  4.55  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  3.81  3.01  3.68  3.95  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.84  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.00  3.99  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	12				
				?	0						