Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LARSEN, KELLI M

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1545 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Eze					Tnat		Course	Dont	TIMDO	Torrol	Coat
Questions	MD	NA	1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	Mean		Sect Mean
Quescions		INA							Railk	Mean				
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1599/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	419/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	1	1		****/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1285/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	2	0	2		1400/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96	3.91	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	0	2	5		1110/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	10		116/1651		4.57	4.18	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1673		4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1237/1656	4.12	4.28	4.07	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	0	6	4.09	1456/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	589/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	857/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	161/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	0	1	5	3.67	1092/1520	3.75	4.46	4.01	4.03	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	0	0	6		1024/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	1210/1511	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	1	1	3		600/ 994		3.99	3.94	3.98	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260		3.33	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	3.67		4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233		4.33	4.20	4.48	***
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95		3.63	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	****
0.15 - 1														
Self Paced	1 2	0	0	0	^	0	1	F 00	****/ 61	2 75	2 75	4 00	4 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	, 01		3.75	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 52 ****/ 50	3.67	3.67	4.26 4.44	4.53 4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 50	3.63	3.63	4.44	4.42	
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 .

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

WALSH, KATHLEEN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1546 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	768/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	737/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	769/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	737/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.22	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	4.84	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	310/1656	4.12	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1225/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	810/1520	3.75		4.01	4.03	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.56	3.99	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	3.55	3.55	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work		0	0	0	^	1	_	4 00	****/ 76	4 00	4 1 7	2 00	2 07	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	3.50	3.83	3.93	4.20	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	3.75	3.75		4.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0						4.26	4.53	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50 ****/ 35	3.63 ****	3.63 ****	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 31	****		4.36	4.50	****
J. Here energy proceers for all the schuelles	0	J	U	J	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 31			7.37	4.50	

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: WALSH, KATHLE

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

WALSH, KATHLEEN

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1546 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

MORRIS, KATHERI

15 Questionnaires: 12

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1547 Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue:	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	0	0	2	_	2	_	_	2 00	1600/1674	2 60	1 26	4 07	4 20	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	0	3	2	2		1628/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	2	4		1479/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	2	0	1		1332/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	1 3	4 2	2		1507/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1 1	3	2	1	0	1 2		1440/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96 4.08	3.91 4.03	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3 2	0	2	1	1	4	2		1509/1535 1513/1651	3.60 4.22	4.33	4.08	4.03	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	6		1072/1673	4.22	4.73	4.16	4.20	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	<i>3</i>	0	0	0	1	1	1		955/1656		4.73		4.10	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	U	U	U	1	Т	1	4.00	955/1656	4.12	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1430/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1374/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1272/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1264/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	622/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.10
Discussion	0	0	_	^	0	2	2	2 50	1160/1500	2 75	1 16	4 01	4 02	2 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2 2	0	2	0	2 2	3 2	3 6	4.40	1169/1520	3.75	4.46	4.01	4.03	3.50 4.40
	3	0	0	1	2	2	4		759/1515 1050/1511	4.16 4.27	4.61 4.69	4.24	4.28	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	6	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	, -				3.98	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	О	U	Τ	U	2	U	3.33	811/ 994	3.50	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	249/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	150/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	252/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	223/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	4.33
Seminar	-	-1	1	^	0	_	-1	2 50	00/102	2 55	2 55	4 41	4 07	2 50
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7 7	1 0	1	0	0 1	2	1	3.50	89/ 103 72/ 101	3.55	3.55	4.41	4.07	3.50 4.00
		0	0		1	3 1	1	4.00	,	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	1		80/ 95 86/ 99	3.63 3.75	3.63	4.31	4.33	3.50 3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8 8	0	0	1	0	1	2	3.75 4.00	86/ 99 50/ 97		3.75 4.00	4.39		4.00
5. Were Criteria for grading made crear	0	U	U	Т	U	Т	۷	4.00	50/ 9/	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.03	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	3.50	3.83	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Colf Dered														
Self Paced	0	0	1	0	٥	2	1	2 50	11/ 61	2 75	2 75	4 00	4 22	2 50
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0 1	1	0	0		1	3.50	44/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8 8	1	0 1	0	1 0	2	0	3.67	39/ 52		3.67	4.26	4.53	3.67 3.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	3	0	0	0	1	0	3.00	47/ 50 ****/ 35	3.63 ****	3.63	4.44	4.42	3.00 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	2	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.36	4.63 4.50	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	O	۷	Τ	U	U	т	U	2.50	/ 31			4.34	4.50	

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1547 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad 1	L2	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here a	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to b	oe sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1548 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	0	3	8		1075/1674		4.36	4.27	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0 2	1 2	2	1 4		1016/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.00
<ol> <li>Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li> <li>Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	0 1	1 1	0 4	1	2	5 2	3		1260/1609 1485/1585	3.94 3.27	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.85 2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	3	4		1022/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	4		1050/1651		4.57	4.18	4.20	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9		1040/1673		4.73	4.69	4.67	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	2		882/1656			4.07	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	5		1260/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	7		1300/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1 1	1 2	4 2	6 7	4.25	935/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.25 4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.25	958/1575 406/1380	4.29 4.49	4.56 4.05	4.27 3.94	4.39	4.25
	3	U	U	U	4	3	O	4.30	400/1300	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	967/1520		4.46	4.01	4.03	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	999/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	3 2	0 6	0 1	0 1	1 0	2	8 2	4.64	535/1511 732/ 994		4.69 3.99	4.27 3.94	4.28 3.98	4.64 3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	O	_		U	4	_	3.30	132/ 334	3.30	3.33	3.94	3.90	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	229/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	188/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	88/ 103	3.55	3.55	4.41	4.07	3.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	74/ 95	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11 11	0	0	1	1 1	1 1	0	3.00	****/ 99 ****/ 97	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	U	U	Т	1	Т	U	3.00	***/ 9/	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	41/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	3.83	3.93	4.20	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	29/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 52		3.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	35/ 50	3.63	3.63	4.44	4.42	4.25
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	U	1	1	0	0	∠.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	^ ^ * *

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor:

MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1548 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 31

ALSH, KATHLEEN Fall 2005

Page 1549 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	1	28	4.90	148/1674	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	96/1674	4.62	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	132/1423	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	141/1609	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	24	4.67	224/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	131/1535	4.65	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	81/1651	4.62	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1673	4.86	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	123/1656	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	284/1586	4.63	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	227/1585	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	189/1582	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	181/1575	4.68	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	207/1380	4.26	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	120/1520	4.70	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1515	4.81	4.61	4.24	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	122/1511	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	414/ 994	4.02	3.99	3.94	3.98	4.16
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.42	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	3.33	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 259	****	3.67	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.33	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	****	4.17	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	3.83	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	3.75	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	3.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	3.63	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1549 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	23	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	1						

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 28

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1550 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did you	ı dəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	195/1674	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.86
-	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	110/1674	4.62	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.93
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	188/1423	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.82
	_	ations reflect		=	0	0	0	0	2	1	25	4.82	162/1609	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.82
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	148/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.79
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86		4.65	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.86
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	5	23		163/1651	4.62	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.82
		was class canc		iiica	0	0	0	1	0	1	26		796/1673	4.86	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.86
	-			hing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	4	16		149/1656		4.28	4.07		4.80
		Lectur																
1. Were th	ne instru	nctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	231/1586	4.63	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.89
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93		4.94	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.93
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	161/1582	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.89
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	181/1575	4.68	4.56		4.39	4.89
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	143/1380	4.26	4.05		4.03	
5. Did aud	iiovisuai	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	Т	5	22	4.75	143/1300	4.20	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.75
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	. ,	4.70	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.80
		_	_	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	242/1515	4.81	4.61	4.24		4.88
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	266/1511	4.75		4.27		4.88
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	3	0	0	7	2	13	4.27	351/ 994	4.02	3.99	3.94	3.98	4.27
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.36	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for ind	lividual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.45	***
				what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	4.33	****
	_	ns contribute		_	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.22	****
		or grading mad			26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	4.63	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Ту	ne.			Majors	
																		, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 19		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		_		,				0		, -				1.0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Gei	nera	Τ				2	Under-g	rad 2	28	Non-	-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0										_	,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0		0.1					_	0	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	8						

0

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: Planell, Joan

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 30

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1551 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				eque:			_		ructor		_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	406/1674	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	7	11	7	4.00	1146/1674	4.62	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	7	1	0	6	5	3	3.60	1249/1423	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.36	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	1	6	12	4	3.83	1272/1609	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	10	10	4.04	742/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	619/1535	4.65	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	3	12	9		1009/1651	4.62	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	5	19		1015/1673	4.86	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	805/1656	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	3	9	9		1230/1586		4.55	4.43	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	510/1585	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	4	8	10		1052/1582	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7 6	0 8	0	1 1	3 5	8 5	11	4.26	949/1575	4.68	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Ь	8	2	Т	5	5	3	3.38	1108/1380	4.26	4.05	3.94	4.03	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	529/1520	4.70	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	594/1515	4.81	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	751/1511	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	691/ 994	4.02	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.45	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	***	4.00	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.17	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.83	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.75	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	3.63	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 15

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I Baltimore County

Page 1552 Title JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1 г	id vou	rain net	v insights,ski	_	m this course	٥	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.67
			or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.67
			estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.67
		_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.48	4.22	4.23	5.00
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.67
		_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.33	4.08	4.03	5.00
			system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1651		4.57	4.18	4.20	5.00
			vas class canc		11100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00
	_				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		615/1656	4.33	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.33
		- 1 5-												,					
			Lectur	e															
1. W	ere the	instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.67
			or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. W	as lecti	are mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.35	5.00
			s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.39	5.00
5. D	id audi	ovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.67	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.67
			_	_	_														
			Discus	sion															
1. D	id class	s discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.01	4.03	5.00
2. W	ere all	student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.00
3. D	id the	instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. W	lere spe	cial ted	chniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.50
					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cred	lits Earı	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
	07		0 00 0 00										1						1
00- 28-		0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 0		ке	quire	ea I	or Ma	Jors	5	1	Graduat	=	0	Majo	or.	1
28- 56-		2	2.00-2.99	0	В 0 С 0		Cos	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	3	Non	major	2
	·83 ·150	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 0	D 0		Gei	nera.	L				U	under-g	Lau	3	NON-	ına jor	2
Gra		0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		רם.	ectiv	TO G				0	#### - 1	Moona t	horo a	ro not	onous	rh
GLa	iu.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		₽.T.¢	CCLI	765				U	respons				_	111
					I 0		<b>∩</b> +1	her					2	respons	a LU L	e sigi	ııııcal.		
					Ι 0		OLI	ner.					4						

Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

0

3.50-4.00

4

Grad.

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1553 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	u gain ne		ls from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	233/1674	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.81
_	_		the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	96/1674		4.52	4.23	4.21	4.94
			the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	_	12	4.50	575/1423		4.42	4.27		4.50
	_		the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	222/1609		4.48	4.22	4.27	4.75
			ite to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13		131/1585		4.05	3.96	3.95	4.81
	_	-	bute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13		127/1535		4.33	4.08	4.15	4.81
		g system clearly		0	0	0	0	1	5			445/1651		4.57	4.18		4.56
		was class cance		0	0	0	0	0	6	10		1114/1673			4.69	4.68	4.63
			l teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	10		214/1656				4.07	
		Lecture															
1. Were ti	he instr	actor's lectures		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	150/1586	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.94
			sted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585		4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00
			and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	180/1582		4.54	4.26	4.26	4.88
			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1575			4.27	4.25	5.00
			ance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	13		155/1380				4.01	
5. Did au	.uiovisuai	r techniques enn	dance your understanding	U	_	U	1	U	1	13	4.73	155/1560	4.13	4.05	3.34	4.01	4.73
		Discuss		_			_		_								
			te to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0			4.93	94/1520		4.46	4.01		4.93
			ouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	,		4.61	4.24	4.32	4.67
		_	air and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511			4.27		4.87
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful	1	4	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	447/ 994	3.68	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.09
		Laborat	ory														
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	e background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.24	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.10	****
	-	-	or individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	***	4.00	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did re	search pr	coiects contribu	te to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	3.91	****
			o what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.29	****
		for grading made		15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	3.48	****
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
			_	-													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 3														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0 C 3		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L6	Non-	major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6 D 0														
Q	0	2 50 4 00	4								^	0.000		. 1			1

Electives

Other

0

16

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

1

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201 University of Maryland

Page 1554 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: HALL, DIANE Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 30

	stionnaires: 23	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnair
--	-----------------	---	---------	--------	------------	--------------

		0				377		_	ncie		-		tructor		Dept			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1		3	-4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	2	6	8	5	3.64	1464/1674	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.26	3.64
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	7	10	4		1358/1674		4.52	4.23	4.21	3.77
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	1	6	5	10	4.09	962/1423	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.09
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	5	4	6	7	3.68	1366/1609	4.22	4.48	4.22	4.27	3.68
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	708/1585	4.45	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.10
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	what you learned	2	0	2	0	7	5	7	3.71	1177/1535	4.26	4.33	4.08	4.15	3.71
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	832/1651	4.42	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.29
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	887/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	12	5	3	3.55	1353/1656	4.13	4.28	4.07	4.07	3.55
		Lecture	2															
1 Ware t	he instri	actor's lecture		arenared	1	0	0	2	Ω	6	6	2 72	1424/1586	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.42	3.73
		ctor seem inter			1	-	0	0	4	7			1367/1585		4.77	4.69	4.66	4.32
				xplained clearly	2	-	1		4				1367/1582		4.54	4.26	4.26	3.62
		es contribute to			1	0	2	2	5	7			1351/1575		4.56		4.25	
				our understanding	1	-	2	1	8	4	-		1028/1380			3.94		
J. Dia aa	alovibaa	r cccimiiques em	nance y	Jar understanding	_	_	2	_	O	-	O	3.32	1020/1300	1.13	1.05	3.71	1.01	3.32
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	645/1520	4.59	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.25
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	808/1515	4.51	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.35
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	358/1511	4.83	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.80
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		3	5	2	1	7	1	4	3.27	832/ 994	3.68	3.99	3.94	3.96	3.27
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				1														
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 11														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				2	2						
				? 1														

### Course-Section: SOWK 387 8020 University of Maryland Page 1555 Title POL/PROG/SERV: CHILDREN Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: Love, Yvonna 11

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 11

## Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_			Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 .1															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.64
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.55
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	528/1423	4.55	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.55
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.45
5. Did a	assigned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.00
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	260/1535	4.64	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.64
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.64
8. How m	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How w	vould you s	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.38
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	816/1586	4.55	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.55
2. Did t	the instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was 1	Lecture mat	erial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	481/1582	4.64	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.64
4. Did t	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	537/1575	4.64	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.64
5. Did a	audiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	831/1380	3.86	4.05	3.94	4.01	3.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	185/1520	4.82	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.82
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	420/1515	4.73	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.73
3. Did t	the instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	535/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.64
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful		0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	139/ 994	4.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.70
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe.			Majors	
			. – – – – – .							- 				. <del>-</del> 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1								_	_	_	_			_
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera.	L				9	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Page 1556
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		General	=		5	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	254/1674	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.79
		w insights,skil tor make clear			5 5	0	0	0	1	3 4	19	4.79	254/16/4		4.50	4.27	4.26	4.79
		estions reflect			5	0	1	0	1	3	19	4.63	431/1423	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.21	4.63
	_	ations reflect			5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	109/1609	4.42	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.92
				what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	20	4.67	224/1585	3.59	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.67
	_	_		o what you learned	5	1	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	319/1535	4.19	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.57
		system clearly		-	5	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	104/1651	4.28	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.92
		was class cance	_		5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	465/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.45
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	192/1586	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.92
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	640/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.88
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	136/1582	4.44	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.91
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	203/1575	4.53	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.88
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	5	18	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	****/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	****
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	179/1520	4.52	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.82
		_	_	d to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1515	4.76	4.61	4.24	4.32	5.00
				d open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.94
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		12	5	0	2	4	0	6	3.83	600/ 994	3.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	3.83
		Laborat	-															
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequat	e back	ground information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.24	****
		Seminar																
				announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.10	****
				ividual attention	27	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.30	****
	_	-		what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	3.91	****
_		ons contribute to contribute to the contribute t		-	27 27	1 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	3.75 4.00	4.39	4.29	****
J. WEIE C.	riceria i	or grading made	ciear		21	_	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	, 51		1.00	1.11	3.40	
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	8
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 19		Re	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	 jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot]	her				2	3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR

Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1557 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnair		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
----------------------------------------	--	---------	--------	------------	---------------

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201

21

HUMAN BEHAVIOR

SKIBA, DAVID

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	4	4	4			1558/1674		4.36		4.26	3.35
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	3	2	7	4		1370/1674		4.52	4.23	4.21	3.75
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	2	3	5	6		1169/1423		4.42	4.27	4.27	3.76
		uations reflect			2	1	1	1	0	8			1198/1609		4.48	4.22	4.27	3.93
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	6	4	3	3	1		1556/1585		4.05	3.96	3.95	2.35
		-		what you learned	0	1 0	0 4	3 1	3 1	5 5	5		1147/1535		4.33	4.08	4.15	3.75
	_	g system clearly		inea		0	0	0	0	0	6 16	5.00	1454/1651			4.18	4.16	3.47 5.00
	-	was class cance			1 2	1	1	4	2	2	10 5		1/1673		4.73	4.69	4.68	
9. HOW WO	ula you	grade the overa	II teac	ning effectiveness	2	Т	Τ	4	2	2	5	3.43	1412/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.07	3.43
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well ]	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	837/1586	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.53
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1158/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.59
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1378/1582	4.44	4.54	4.26	4.26	3.59
4. Did the	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1254/1575	4.53	4.56	4.27	4.25	3.82
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir					0	1	3	7	2	4	3.29	1145/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	3.29
	•																	
		Discus			_		_	_	_		_							
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4			942/1520		4.46	4.01		3.88
		_	_	d to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4		4.50			4.61	4.24	4.32	4.50
		_		d open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	4	8		1004/1511		4.69	4.27	4.34	4.13
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	sstul		1	8	2	2	Τ	1	2	2.88	927/ 994	3.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	2.88
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	e lab in	crease understa	-	f the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	3.42	4.23	4.26	****
			_	ground information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.24	****
_	_	_		or lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.33	4.46	4.49	****
	_	structor provid			16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.67	4.33	4.33	****
1 Were a	agianed	Semina:	_	announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 103	****	3 55	4.41	4 10	****
i. Were a	bbigned	copies relevant	co ciic	amounced eneme	13	_	O	O	Ü	U	_	3.00	/ 103		3.33	1.11	1.10	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_		_							_			_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Gei	nera	Τ				4	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	5
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 4 D 1																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						EΙ	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ın
P 0											_	0	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
I 0					Otl	ner				1	.2							
? 1																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Title	HUMAN BEHAVIOR
Instructor:	Thiel, Mindy
Enrollment:	30

Course-Section: SOWK 388 8020

Questionnaires: 31

Page 1558 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	298/1674	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	270/1674	4.42	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	517/1423	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	629/1609	4.42	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	3		11	3.75	1049/1585	3.59	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	667/1535	4.19	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	583/1651	4.28	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	972/1673	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	257/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.67
Lecture	_				_				004/4506	4 = 0				
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	231/1586		4.55	4.43	4.42	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	591/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	227/1582	4.44	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	181/1575	4.53	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	173/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	156/1520	4.52	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	1	4	24	4.79	336/1515	4.76	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	1	2	26	4.86	289/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful		0 8	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	297/ 994	3.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.38
Frequ		. 54												
Frequ	lency	שוst	ribi	11101	1									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	21	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	19	_				
				?	0							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101

27

HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

Page 1559 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

C+	<b>~</b>	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questions								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. D	id vou c	ain new	v insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	287/1674	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.77
			or make clear			1	0	0	0	0	2	2.4	4.92	110/1674	4.86	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.92
			estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	146/1423	4.79	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.88
		_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	97/1609	4.65	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.92
					what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	326/1585	4.45	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.50
	-		_		o what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	119/1535	4.77	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.83
			system clearly			2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	151/1651	4.82	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.84
			vas class canc		IIICa	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.42	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.96
	_				hing effectiveness	9	1	0	1	0	1		4.76	178/1656		4.28	4.07	4.07	4.76
,		. 100 91	add die overd	0000	ning circociveness		_	Ū	_	ŭ	_		1.70	17071000	1.50	1.20	1.07	1.07	11.70
	Lecture																		
1. W	Jere the	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	618/1586	4.79	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.69			
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	1	0	0	1	2.4	4.81	811/1585	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.81
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	0	0	4	20	4.68	423/1582	4.78	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.68
			s contribute to			2 1	1	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	69/1575	4.86	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.96
					our understanding	2	15	5	0	2	1	2		1324/1380	2.50	4.05	3.94	4.01	2.50
3. 2	- La aaal	V15 441	occiminadach cir	1	our understanding	_			Ū	_	_	_	2.50	1011, 1000	2.50	1.00	3.71	1.01	2.50
			Discus	sion															
1. D	id class	discus	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	162/1520	4.80	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.85
					d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	207/1515	4.82	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.90
			_	_	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	244/1511	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.90
			chniques succe		-	7	7	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	193/ 994	4.54	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.54
	-		-																
					Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	n									
Cred	lits Earr	ied	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	oe			Majors	
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 19						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduate	e	0	Majo	r	18
	28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3																		
	56-83 6 2.00-2.99 4 C 0						Gei	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	major	9
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																		
Gra	Grad. $0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0$						Ele	ectiv	res				2	#### - 1				_	h
Р 0													response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
I 0						Otl	her				2	1							

?

0

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201 University of Maryl Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II Baltimore County Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL Fall 2005

University of Maryland Page 1560
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15			
Questionnaires:	14	Student Cou	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire

?

0

Questions							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did v	zou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	4	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	891/1674	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.30
_		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	215/1674		4.52	4.23	4.21	4.80
		uestions reflec			4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1423	4.79	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.70
	_	uations reflect		_	4	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	687/1609	4.65	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.38
				what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	413/1585		4.05	3.96	3.95	4.40
	_	_		o what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	215/1535	4.77	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.70
		g system clearl			4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	175/1651	4.82	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.80
		was class canc			5	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1626/1673	4.42	4.73	4.69	4.68	3.89
	-			hing effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.00
	Lecture																	
1		,	-	•	•	0	•		0	4 00	040/1506	4 50	4 55	4 42	4 40	4 00		
		uctor's lecture			5 6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586		4.55	4.43	4.42	4.89
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585		4.77	4.69	4.66	4.88
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	./	4.88	180/1582		4.54	4.26	4.26	4.88
				-	6	0	0	0	1	0	./	4.75	359/1575		4.56	4.27	4.25	4.75
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1380	2.50	4.05	3.94	4.01	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	229/1520	4.80	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.75
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	384/1515	4.82	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.75
		_	_	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.88
		echniques succe			8	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994		3.99	3.94	3.96	****
	_	-																
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 07															0			7
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1					ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	7
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					0	nera:	1				0	Under-q	wod 1	1	More	mo i o	7
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Ge	nera.	L				U	unaer-g	ıau 1	.4	NON-	major	/
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					רים	ecti					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	nc+	0200111	.h	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					E1	ecti	ves				U	respons				_	111	
					0-1	la					4	respons	es to L	e sign	iiiidan	I L		
				I 0	Other					4								

Course-Section:	SOWK 390F 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1561
Title	ADVOCATES PROGRAM	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Indtructor:	TADMEN ALICOM	E-11 2005	Tob TDDD2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: HARVEY, ALISON Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 1

			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	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.52	4.23	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.48	4.22	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.57	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.00

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390J 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADDICTIVE BEHAVIOR Baltimore County
Instructor: DVORAK, MICHAEL Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

27

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	737/1674	4.41	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	870/1423	4.23	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	466/1609	4.52	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	13	4.32	502/1585	4.32	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	15	4.41	508/1535	4.41	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	2	15	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	901/1586	4.47	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	510/1582	4.61	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	407/1575	4.72	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	325/1380	4.47	4.05	3.94	4.01	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	673/1520	4.22	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	533/1515	4.61	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	154/ 994	4.64	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1562

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

### Course-Section: SOWK 390W 0101 University of Maryland Page 1563 Title SOWK PRACTICE IN AGING Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: Mays, Maria 7

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7

## Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.75
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.52	4.23	4.21	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.48	4.22	4.27	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.50
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.57	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.28	4.07	4.07	5.00
		Lectur																
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.01	4.09	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.61	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair ar	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.50
		Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n											
Omodite T	Expected Grades				D.					m				Modern				
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Re.	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	3	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0101 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Baltimore County

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN Enrollment: 16

Questionna

JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 1564

naires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair
---------------------------------------------------

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	0	11	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	277/1585	4.58	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	283/1656	4.64	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585		4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.83
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	134/1520	4.91	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.91	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.91	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	189/ 994	4.55	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.55

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

### Course-Section: SOWK 470 0101 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1565

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	509/1674	4.29	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.59
_	_	ctor make clear			7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	554/1674		4.52	4.23	4.31	4.53
		uestions reflec		- 3	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	153/1423	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.88
	_	uations reflect		_	8	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	242/1609	4.55	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.73
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	632/1585	4.19	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.18
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	355/1535	4.46	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.53
		g system clearl			7	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	163/1651	4.78	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.82
		was class cand			7	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	301/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.19	4.62
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	128/1586	4.74	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.94
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.94
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	1	16	4.94	91/1582	4.37	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.94
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1575	4.30	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.94
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	2	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	666/1380	3.73	4.05	3.94	4.04	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	281/1520	4.14	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.69
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	242/1515	4.30	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.88
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	171/1511	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.94
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		8	3	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	297/ 994	3.88	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.38
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27							anir		or Ma	ion		0	Graduat		0	Majo		16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		1/6/	quil	cu I	J_ 1410	בטני	D	U	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	10
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	2.4	Non-	-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		001	c. a	-				•	onacı 9	2		1,011		J
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
2200.	Ü	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0	Other						1	.5			3-		-	
				2 0	Otner						-							

Course-Section: SOWK 470 8020 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH Baltimore County

SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH Baltimore County TING, LAURA Fall 2005

Instructor: TING, LAURA

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1566 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructo: Rai		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1 P/4		General		1-1								4 00	1106/	1674	4 00	4 26	4 07	4 40	4 00
_	_	' insights,skil or make clear			0	0	1 0	1 1	3	2 5	8 6		1196/ 1104/			4.36 4.52	4.27 4.23	4.42 4.31	4.00 4.07
		stions reflect			0	0	1	0	5	5			1180/		4.30	4.42	4.27	4.34	3.73
	_	tions reflect	_		0	1	0	0	2	5	7				4.55	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.36
		dings contribu	_	_	0	0	0	3	0	3	9	4.20	612/		4.19	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.20
	_	_		hat you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	508/		4.46	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.40
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	254/	1651	4.78	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.73
		as class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/	1673	4.97	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overal	l teachin	g effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1237/	1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.19	3.75
		Lecture																	
		tor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	3	1			826/			4.55	4.43	4.46	4.53
		or seem intere		-	0	0	0	0	1	3			1071/		4.80	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.67
		rial presented	_	-	0	0	0	2	3	6			1272/			4.54	4.26		3.80
		contribute to	_		0	0	2	1	1	7			1329/		4.30	4.56	4.27		3.67
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance your	understanding	0	0	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1059/	1380	3.73	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.47
1. Did cla	Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learne							1	3	4	5	3.60	1129/	1520	4.14	4.46	4.01	4.18	3.60
2. Were a	ll student	s actively end	ouraged t	o participate	0	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1221/	1515	4.30	4.61	4.24	4.40	3.73
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage f	air and c	pen discussion	1	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1027/	1511	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.07
4. Were s	pecial tec	hniques succes	sful		0	2	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	791/	994	3.88	3.99	3.94	4.19	3.38
		Laborat	-				_			_									
2. Were y	ou provide	d with adequat	e backgro	und information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	278	****	4.13	4.19	4.21	****
		Seminar	:																
				dual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	101	****	4.00	4.48	4.65	****
		jects contribu			14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	95	****	3.63	4.31	4.60	****
		s contribute t		u learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	99	****	3.75	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	97	****	4.00	4.14	4.46	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;				Туј	pe			Majors				
00-27	A 3		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Grad	duate	 e	0	 Majo	 r	12			
28-55							-1 00 -1 1		10		-	-	o_u		-	-		_	
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 4					Gei	nera	1				0	Und	er-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	3
84-150																		-	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 0												res	ponse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	P 0 ? 0						her				1	1							

### Course-Section: SOWK 481 0101 University of Maryland Page 1567 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 11

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Ougstionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1674	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	673/1674	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	353/1609		4.48	4.22	4.30	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	584/1585		4.05	3.96	4.01	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	870/1535		4.33	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.67	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1146/1656	4.15	4.28	4.07	4.19	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	286/1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	635/1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1515	4.72	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.13	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.00
Frequ	Dist	crib	utio	n										

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General		Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0201 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1568 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Level Mean		Sec
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 298/1674 4.39 4.36 4.2 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 14 4.81 207/1674 4.53 4.52 4.2 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 12 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1423 4.60 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 2 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 147/1609 4.58 4.48 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 0 3 3 8 4.13 672/1585 3.92 4.05 3.9 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.33 4.0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.1 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4		all Me	Mea
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 298/1674 4.39 4.36 4.2 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 14 4.81 207/1674 4.53 4.52 4.2 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 12 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1423 4.60 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 2 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 147/1609 4.58 4.48 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 0 3 3 8 4.13 672/1585 3.92 4.05 3.9 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.33 4.0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.1 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 207/1674 4.53 4.52 4.2 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 12 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1423 4.60 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 2 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 147/1609 4.58 4.48 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 0 3 3 8 4.13 672/1585 3.92 4.05 3.9 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.33 4.0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.1 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0   Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4	4.42	42 4	4.7
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 12 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1423 4.60 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 2 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 147/1609 4.58 4.48 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 0 3 3 8 4.13 672/1585 3.92 4.05 3.9 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.33 4.0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.1 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			4.8
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 2 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 147/1609 4.58 4.48 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 0 3 3 8 4.13 672/1585 3.92 4.05 3.9 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.33 4.0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.1 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 0 3 3 8 4.13 672/1585 3.92 4.05 3.96 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.33 4.07 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.18 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.09  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			4.8
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 169/1535 4.33 4.03 4.07. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.18. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.69. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.09.  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.49.			4.1
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 231/1651 4.67 4.57 4.1 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			4.7
8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 15 1 4.06 1541/1673 4.44 4.73 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			4.7
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 6 7 4.29 680/1656 4.15 4.28 4.0  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4			4.0
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 753/1586 4.36 4.55 4.4	4.19	19 4.	4.2
	4.46	46 4.	4.6
			5.0
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 246/1582 4.56 4.54 4.2	4.31	31 4.	4.8
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 2 13 4.87 214/1575 4.50 4.56 4.2			4.8
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 4 3 0 1 0 6 3.60 998/1380 3.41 4.05 3.9		04 3.	3.6
Discussion			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 229/1520 4.44 4.46 4.0	4.18	18 4.	4.7
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 289/1515 4.72 4.61 4.2	4.40	40 4.	4.8
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1511 4.84 4.69 4.2	4.45	45 5.	5.0
4. Were special techniques successful 7 3 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 186/994 4.13 3.99 3.9	4.19	19 4.	4.5
Field Work			
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4.86	86 **	* * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 4.17 3.83 3.9	4.24	_ 1	* * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 18 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 53 **** **** 4.4	4.86	86 **	* * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 18 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.1	4.13	13 **	* * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4.48	48 **	* * *
Frequency Distribution			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	Majors	ors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Ma			 14
	or	_	14
	37		
56-83	Non-major		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0301 University of Maryland

SOCIAL WORK METHODS II Baltimore County

I

?

0

0

Title SOCIAL WORK Instructor: TING, LAURA

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

Fall 2005

JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1569

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

~																				
	Questions							Fr	requencie		3		Inst	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
							NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General								0	2	_	_	_	2 70	1200/	1 6 7 1	4 20	1 20	4 07	4 40	2 70
	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	2 1	5 4	6 3	5 10	4.22	1398/1 968/1			4.36 4.52	4.27	4.42	3.78 4.22
			estions reflec			6 6	0 15	0	0	1	0	2		****/			4.42	4.23		****
		_	ations reflect				0	1	0	4	5	0		1061/			4.42	4.27	4.34	4.06
					what you learned	6 7	1	1	4	4	4	3		1364/		4.58 3.92	4.40	3.96	4.01	3.25
					to what you learned	6	1	0	2	3	6	6		961/			4.33	4.08	4.18	3.23
			signments contr s system clearl			6	2	0	1	2	1	12		524/1			4.57	4.18	4.23	4.50
			was class canc		ainea	6	1	0	0	0	8	9		1189/			4.73	4.69	4.67	4.53
		-			ching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	3	4	-		955/			4.28		4.19	
۶.	now wot	iiu you g	rade the overa	II LEA	ming effectiveness	13		U	U	3	-1	3	4.00	955/.	1030	4.13	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.00
			Lectur	е																
1.	Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1394/	1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	3.82
2.	Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	7	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	1250/	1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.47
3.	Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and	explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1181/	1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	3.94
4.	Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	7	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1138/	1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.00
5.	Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	7	2	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1217/	1380	3.41	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.00
			Discus																	
1	Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	11	0	2	0	6	1	4	3 38	1230/	1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	3.38
					ed to participate	11	0	1	0	1	1		4.46							4.46
					nd open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	685/1			4.69	4.27		4.46
			chniques succe		id open dibeabbion	11	2	2	0	4	2	3	3.36			4.13			4.19	
			_																	
	D' 1 C'		Field			1.0	0	0	0	-	_	_	4 22	261		4 22	4 15	2 00	1 06	4 22
					what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	36/	76	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.86	4.33
	_	_	_		luation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	34/	77		3.83	3.93	4.24	4.17 ****
			tor available			19	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	,	53	****	****	4.45	4.86	
			could you disc			19	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/	48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****
5.	Did cor	iterences	s help you carr	y out i	field activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/	49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****
					Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
<b>a</b>	.a:		G GD.3		Demonstrad Out de				D.c		_				m				Madage	_
	edits Ea		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	; 				Тур	pe 			Majors 	
0.0	0-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Grad	duate	е	0	Majo	or	14
28	3-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6															
56	5-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	10
8	4-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
G:	rad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not end				_	jh	
	P 0						responses to be significant						ıt							

Other

16

Course-Section: SOWK 481 8020 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Baltimore County

Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSA Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 1570

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	4.36	829/1674	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.64	406/1674	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.77	212/1609	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.77	722/1585	3.92	4.40	3.96	4.30	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	253/1535	4.33	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.64	351/1651	4.33	4.53	4.18	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10		1015/1673	4.67	4.73	4.10	4.23	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656		4.73	4.09	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	U	Τ.	4	O	4.45	451/1656	4.15	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	784/1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	612/1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	1	3	1	6	3.62	992/1380	3.41	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	173/1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	186/1515	4.72	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	219/1511	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	174/ 994	4.13	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.58
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.21	****
2ere 100 provided wrom adequate background information	10	J	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 270		1.13	1.17	1.21	

Credits E	arned	d Cum. GPA Expected G			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enoug	h	
				P	0			responses to be sign		gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	0						